



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:


- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

C
1251
25

HD WIDENER




HW L4CT T

1251.25

78d. 1874.







THE
BIBLE DOCTRINE
OF THE
SOUL.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION :
IS THE POPULAR CONCEPTION
OF THE SOUL THAT OF
HOLY SCRIPTURE ?


By CHAS. L. IVES, M. D.

*Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine,
in Yale College.*

NEW HAVEN, CONN. :
(Published for the Author.)
JUDD & WHITE.

F. L. Goddard, Printer, 131 Union Street.

1873.



THE
BIBLE DOCTRINE
OF THE
SOUL.

AN ANSWER TO THE QUESTION :
IS THE POPULAR CONCEPTION
OF THE SOUL THAT OF
HOLY SCRIPTURE ?

Lectures
BY CHAS. L. IVES, M. D.

*Professor of the Theory and Practice of Medicine,
in Yale College.*

© NEW HAVEN, CONN.:
(Published for the Author.)
JUDD & WHITE.

F. L. Goddard, Printer, 181 Union Street.

1878.

44.36

C 1251.25

~~C 1252.130~~

✓

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1874, June 12.

By Exchange
of Duplicates.

✓

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PREFACE,	5
I—SOULS OF ANIMALS,	9
II—MAN A LIKE MORTAL SOUL,	9
III—SOULS OF MEN AND BEASTS DIFFER IN THE POSSI- BILITIES OF THE FUTURE,	10
IV—EXAMPLES OF THE BIBLICAL USAGE OF THE TERM SOUL,	12
V—CORRECTION OF ERRONEOUS INFERENCES,	16
VI—IMMORTALITY AN ATTRIBUTE OF GOD ; A GIFT TO HIS REDEEMED,	25
VII—IMMORTALITY FOR THE RIGHTEOUS REVEALED IN OLD TESTAMENT,	26
VIII—IMMORTALITY NOT BESTOWED UPON THE FINALLY IMPENITENT,	29
IX—SUMMARY OF THIS BIBLICAL DOCTRINE, AND REA- SONS FOR ITS PREVALENT REJECTION,	33
X—BENEFICIAL RESULTS OF THIS DOCTRINE,	36
XI—OBJECTIONS ANSWERED,	57
APPEAL TO CHRISTIANS,	70
APPEAL TO THE IMPENITENT,	73

APPENDIX.

A—ANIMALS AS SOULS,	74
B—OF THE MATERIAL NATURE OF THE SOUL,	77
C—OF THE MORTAL NATURE OF THE SOUL,	81
D—DEAD SOULS VISIBLE AND TANGIBLE,	84
E—THE SOUL AND ITS PARTS,	89
F—SHEOL,.....98, HADES,.....98, GEHENNA,.....102	102
G—NEW TESTAMENT ON INTERMEDIATE STATE,	104
H—THE RESURRECTION,	109
" " OF THE WICKED,	111



PREFACE.

The origin of this little sketch of the Biblical conception of the soul, was on this wise:

One Sabbath, the writer stated to his adult Bible class that immortality, as an essential attribute of the soul, is not only nowhere affirmed in the Bible, as theologians confess, but that it is in fact positively denied. Great surprise was manifested, one present even insisting that the Bible declared the soul should never die, though he could not name chapter and verse. At the request of the class this question was selected for discussion the next Sabbath, with the promise of studying it during the week. On assembling again, it was found that no proof of the soul's inherent immortality had been discovered, though some passages were brought forward from which it had been inferred. The writer presented a carefully selected list of references, and finally, as the whole subject seemed so new and interesting to the class, he promised another Sabbath to bring to each a written slip containing these references. But on reflection, as the class was so large, it seemed easier to print and better to give the passages in full, and then some explanations of misunderstood passages seemed desirable; and so the work grew upon the writer's hand. And it is now presented not to his class alone, but to all earnest students of the Bible.

It is at most but a sketch. From among the multitude of proof texts on this point, the writer has endeavored merely to present a sufficient number. And, to stimulate inquiry and remove obstacles which have hindered independent research, he has made some suggestions, rather than an elaborate argument. In these matters which revelation alone may presume to decide, he has desired to lead the reader back to the Bible, to study for himself the teachings of that inspired guide.

If such return to the Biblical standard of our faith was demanded in Luther's day, it is likewise sadly needed at the present. In the issue for April, '72, of a religious quarterly published at New Haven, we find a theological professor re-echoing this strange sentiment one of our most popular preachers had uttered not long before—"No doubt we at the present day know more of spiritual things than did the apostles." (!) Know more of spiritual things than the men inspired by the Holy Ghost for the especial work of teaching these very truths!—more than Peter and John, more than Paul who "conferred not with flesh and blood," (Gal. i: 16,) but was permitted to hear "unspeakable words which it is not lawful (literally, possible) for man to utter." (2 Cor. xii: 4.) Well may we inquire, whither are we drifting, if in spiritual things our religious teachers set themselves above these apostles? In one, and but one respect, have we perhaps an advantage over them. Though Paul was "expressly" informed by the Spirit (1 Tim. iv. 1, 2, 2 Thess. ii.) of "perilous times in the latter days," when "some should depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils," yet we can hardly think he could have fully anticipated how prevalent and how

persistent should have been that "falling away" from the faith, which history has recorded of the Christian church.

We can but infer that these claiming such pre-eminence in spiritual knowledge, must recognize that those "holy men of old" and themselves are somewhat at variance as regards the truth; so that ignorance on these subjects must pertain to one party or the other, which ignorance they quietly attribute to the apostles. It is true, indeed, that the two do differ; they are divided on the deeply important question of the soul's immortality. Paul declares that immortality is given "to those who, by patient continuance in well doing, *seek for it*;" (Romans II: 7.) Our teachers assert that it is already the inalienable possession of every man!

It is time for the Church to awake and seriously ponder these questions. Our religious teachers in these matters start from a false premise. Let the Bible testify against them, and let each earnest-hearted Christian, in his child-like study of the Holy Word, be their judge. Let the Bible speak for itself, untrammelled by human tradition.

To assist in its better understanding has been the especial aim of this little work.

Finally, the writer may be permitted to refer to the great satisfaction and comfort which he has derived from this Biblical view of the soul and its destiny. In comparing his former conceptions of this and kindred truths with his present understanding of the same, he is forcibly reminded of a like contrast in the appearance of objects seen through an optical instrument out of focus, and the same when the field of vision is brought to its proper focus. In the latter case the previous obscurity and uncertainty of

definition vanish, and every thing comes out sharp, clear and well defined. It is his earnest prayer that thus to others the Spirit of all Truth may bless His own word, by the clearer shining of that light, to increase the gratitude and devotion of Christian hearts, and to arouse the impenitent that they too may "LAY HOLD ON ETERNAL LIFE!"

C. L. I.

NEW HAVEN, CONN., Nov., 1872.

The Bible Doctrine of the Soul.

I. THE BIBLE declares that Animals have souls.

In the account of their creation we find this language:

Gen. 1:30. "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to every thing that creepeth upon the earth, *wherein* there is *life*;" Hebrew, "nephesh chayah," *a living soul*. Again, Gen. 1:20; "Let the waters bring forth the moving creature *that hath life*," Hebrew, *a living soul*.

II. Man in like manner has a soul, which likewise dies.

Gen. 2:7. "And the Lord God formed man ['of' is supplied by our translators] the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a *living soul*;" Hebrew, "nephesh chayah," precisely the same Hebrew words as used above of animals. St. Paul comments on "living soul," 1 Cor. xv:45, 47; "The first man, Adam, was made a living soul. The first man is *of the earth, earthy*." Moses explains "breath of life" by its application in Gen. vii:21, 22, "All flesh died that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the

earth, and every man, all in whose nostrils was the 'breath of life' died." Eccl. iii: 19; "For that which befallerh the sons of men befallerh beasts; as the one dieth, so dieth the other; yea, they have all one breath." Gen. ii: 17, 19; "Unto Adam the Lord God said: In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou* eat bread, till *thou* return unto the ground, for out of it wast *thou* taken; for dust *thou* art and unto dust shalt *thou* return." Psalms, cXLVI: 4; "His breath goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth, in that very day his *thoughts* perish."

III. What difference according to the Bible between the life of a man, and that of a beast?

Death comes alike to each. At that event, as far as this world is concerned, they stand on a level. Eccl. iii: 19, 20; "A man hath no pre-eminence above a beast; as the one dieth, so dieth the other. All are of the dust, and all turn to dust again." As saith the Psalmist, "Man that is in honor, and understandeth not, is like the beasts that perish;" Psalms XLIX: 20.

Yet a marked difference is revealed in the Bible between the life of men and that of beasts; *we are to live again; they are not.* Eccl. iii: 21; "The spirit of man goeth upward, the spirit of the beast goeth downward to the earth." The spirit* here is the breath of life, as in Eccl. viii: 8, "No man hath power over the spirit, to retain the spirit;"

* NOTE.—The Hebrew word 'ruach' is rendered in English by breath or spirit, the latter from Latin, spiro, I breathe.

evidently meaning the breath, to retain the breath of life. Eccl. xii: 7; "Then shall the spirit return to God who gave it." It is the "breath of life," as Moses called it, that returns to God the giver, not a conscious being, who can *return* to God only as having previously existed with Him.

When is the future life? At the Resurrection, when the good and the wicked dead will have the breath of life restored to them, and they shall be rewarded every one "as his work shall be." "Marvel not at this, for the hour is coming when all that are in the graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man, and shall come forth, they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation," or condemnation, John, v: 28, 29. In accordance with this, Stephen when dying prayed, (Acts, vii: 59,) "Lord Jesus, receive my spirit,"—his "breath of life," (not his soul,) that He might keep for him that life till the resurrection. "And when he had said this, *he* fell asleep," till that promised resurrection. And so Jesus himself on the cross said, "Father, into thy hands I commend (Greek, commit, entrust,) my spirit." And at his resurrection the Father did give back this entrusted life to him; as Paul affirms, Acts, xiii: 30; "God raised him from the dead." Heb. viii: 20; "God brought again from the dead our Lord Jesus Christ." And Peter declares, Acts, ii: 32; "This Jesus hath God raised up," and 1 Pet. i: 21, "God raised him up from the dead and gave him glory."

This Resurrection of our Lord is both the type and the assurance of our re-living. He "who was dead and is alive" (Rev. ii: 8,) saith, "Because I live, ye shall live also," John, xiv: 19. "If Christ be *not* raised," argues

Paul, 1 Cor. xv:17, 18, "then they also who have fallen asleep in Christ are **PERISHED**:" that is, they likewise will not be raised, and so of course they perish, for *without a resurrection the dead cannot live again.*

IV. Passages showing the use of the word 'soul' by different writers and speakers in the Bible.

Hear what the Lord God saith in the law of Moses. Lev. xxxiii:30, "Whatsoever *soul* doeth any work in that same day, the *same soul* will I destroy from among his people." Likewise in Numbers xv:30. Also Lev. v:2; "If a *soul* touch any carcass he shall be unclean." So Lev. v:1, 4, 15, 17 and vi:2. Lev. xvii:11, 12; "The blood maketh atonement for the *soul*. No *soul* of you shall eat blood." Lev. xxii:11; "But if the priest *buy any soul* with his money, *he* [as a household slave] shall eat of it"—of the holy things. What a palpable contradiction here between the language of Jehovah and our popular ideas! To buy or sell a soul, according to the former is to buy or sell a human being; the popular notion involves the impossible purchase of an immortal part of "mortal man!"

In Gen. xii:13, Abraham says, "my *soul* shall live because of thee." xix:20, Lot says, "let me escape thither, and my *soul* shall live,"—(otherwise die?) In Numbers xxiii:10, Balaam says, "Let me (Hebrew, my soul) die the death of the righteous." Judges xvi:30, Samson says, "Let me (Hebrew, my soul) die with the Philistines."

In Gen. XLVI:26, Moses writes, "all the *souls* that came with Jacob into Egypt, which came out of his loins." In Joshua XI:11, the writer tells us that the Israelites took Hazor and "they smote all the *souls* that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them." So Josh. X:28, 30, 32, 35, 37, 39.

Take a few from many passages in Psalms. Psalms XXX:3, "O Lord thou hast *brought up my soul from the grave*, thou hast *left me alive* that I should not go down to the pit." So XXXIII:9, "To *deliver their soul from death*, and to keep them alive in famine." LXXVIII:50, "He spared not their *soul* from death, but gave their life over to the pestilence." LXVI:9, "Who holdeth our *soul* in life." XLIX:15, "God will redeem my *soul* from the power of the grave."

In Isaiah LIII:12, the prophet says of Christ, "He poured out his *soul* unto death." Compare now Psalms XVI:10, and the same in Acts II:27, "Thou wilt not *leave my soul* in hell," that is [Hebrew, sheol; Greek, Hades,] the grave. Peter, in Acts II:31, tells us this was spoken of Christ, who was brought to life again, was not left in the grave; and so, that it was *not* spoken of David, who Paul declares, (Acts XIII:36,) did "see corruption;" and who, Peter informs us, (Acts II:34,) "is not ascended into the Heavens."

In Isaiah XXXVIII:17, Hezekiah, on receiving fifteen additional years of life, exclaims, "Thou hast in love to my *soul* delivered it from the pit of corruption," (from the grave.) In Jeremiah, XLIV:7, the Lord inquires, "wherefore commit ye this sin against your *souls*, (your lives, being,) to cut off from you man and woman, child and suckling, out of Judah, to leave you none to remain." Com

pare Numbers xvi:38, where Korah and his company consumed by fire from the Lord are spoken of as "sinners against their own *souls*, (lives.) Ezekiel xviii:4, 20, the Lord saith, "*the soul that sinneth, it shall die.*" In Numbers vi:6 we read of the Nazarite, "he shall come at no dead *body*," Hebrew "*nephesh*," literally *soul*. Numbers ix:6; "There were certain men who were defiled by the dead body of a man," literally, as above "*nephesh*," by the *dead soul* of a man; and so again we have "dead soul" in the Hebrew of the 7th and 10th verses.

In the New Testament we find the same language. James speaks of "saving a *soul* from death," chap. v:20. Rev. xvi:8, "Every living *soul* died in the sea." In Matt. x:28, we are told to "fear Him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," (Greek, Gehenna). Man may destroy the body but he can do no more; the life is, as we have seen, in God's keeping, and he will restore it in the "appointed time," (Job. xiv. 14); yet when he finally destroys the body, and the life of that body, in Gehenna, from that fearful "second death" there is no more a resurrection!

Matt. xvi:25, 26. "For whosoever will save his life, (Greek, *psuche*) shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life, (*psuche*) shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world, and lose his own soul, (*psuche*), or what shall a man give in exchange for his soul, (*psuche*)?" It looks here as if our translators wished to give this passage a shade of meaning which the original does not convey. Evidently, the close union of the two verses by the connective 'for' proves that the word, "*psuche*," must refer to the same thing in each verse. As

the translators use 'soul' in the latter verse, and that is unquestionably a proper rendering of the Greek, we may also use it in the former. We then read "Whosoever will save his soul (in this world) shall lose it (in the next); and whosoever will lose his soul for my sake shall find it." How evidently then does this saying of the Lord Jesus contradict the popular theory, which, according to its philosophical conceptions of the soul, consistently holds that a 'lost soul' in this world is a 'lost soul' in the next. But when we throw aside these "oppositions of science" (1 Tim. vi: 20,) with their Romish traditions, and fall back upon the Bible doctrine that losing one's *soul* is losing one's *being*, one's existence, one's life, as it must be, and is, understood in the former verse; then the whole passage is in harmony with itself and with the rest of Scriptures. And then how pertinent the Savior's inquiry, "For what is a man profited if he should gain the whole world and *lose his life*!"

St. Peter, quoting Isaiah says, "all flesh is grass and all the glory of man as the flower of the grass: the grass withereth, the flower falleth away." All the glory of man, in popular estimation, must include the soul; this then he declares 'falleth away' as the flower falls to decay.

This citation of passages may be concluded with the general statement that the Hebrew and Greek words denoting soul and spirit occur over sixteen hundred times in the Bible; "immortal soul," or "immortal spirit" is found in the original or in our translation, NOT ONCE, although so common in our hymn books and on our tongues!

Certainly, if we may judge from the passages we have already considered, we find that the Bible does *not* use the

word soul as synonymous with spirit; it does not restrict the term to a rational, thinking *part* of a man, but applies it to the entire MAN as one complete being; and it hesitates not to speak of a soul *as about to die, as dying, and as dead*, as well as living. Beyond all question then, we find, that the Scriptural conception of a soul, and the usage of that word in all Bible history, far from being identical, is *totally at variance with that of our popular theology.*

V. Passages in the Bible from which the existence of a soul apart from the body has been *inferred*.

1. Gen. xxxv:18. "As her soul was in departing," literal Hebrew, in the going out of her soul or life.

2. 1 Kings xvii:21. "Let this child's soul come into him again," or let his *life*, as our translators so often render the Hebrew word. So, Luke xii:20, "This night thy soul shall be required of thee."

3. Luke xxiii:43. "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in Paradise." Spoken by Christ on the cross to the penitent thief. Here apparently the inference is a fair one, but look more closely. What did the thief request? "Lord, remember me *when* thou comest IN (not "into," as in our translation; the Greek is not 'eis' but 'en,' in) thy Kingdom." Now what should be the reply? That will depend entirely upon the position of the comma. Observe, that the Greek text was originally written without punctuation, which was introduced by Manutius, a printer of Venice, in the fifteenth century, and in one instance

(Matt. xix:29) has been changed by our Bible Society within a recent period. Where, in this passage, then, is the true place of the comma? In the Septuagint and Greek New Testament the adverb to-day, (sémeron) qualifies the following verb 51 times, qualifies the preceeding verb 170 times. Then, as in Deut. viii:19, "I testify against you this day, that ye shall perish," so here, according to the prevalent usage, we read, and the context demands it as a *direct* reply to the thief's petition; "verily, I say unto you this day, thou *shalt* be with me in Paradise." Besides, if it be assumed that Christ and the thief were that day together in Paradise, then we learn that henceforth in Paradise Christ is present in no other sense than he is now on earth. For when, on that assumption, he came back from Paradise to earth at his resurrection, he told Mary Magdalene, (John xx:17) that he had not yet ascended to the Father; but the Father is in heaven, therefore Paradise, where we suppose him to have been, is not heaven; afterward he did ascend to the Father, and is now in heaven, (Heb. ix:24,) consequently *not* in that hypothetical paradise. No, the promise was for that yet future time to which the thief referred, when Christ shall come "in his kingdom," and Paradise, with its tree of Life, (Rev. xxii:2,) shall be restored to us.

4. Luke xvi:19, 31. The story of Dives and Lazarus. Here again through our un-Biblical conception of the soul, have we been misled. This is a parable introduced by the statement, "there was a certain man," etc., precisely as are its neighboring parables. Its scene is laid not in hell, but in the grave; (the Greek is Hades, not Gehenna.) It was spoken to the rich Pharisees, who (verse 4, same chapter) "were covetous, and they derided him." It declares that,

though they are of the seed of Abraham, they are not his acknowledged children, (see Rom. ix: 10,) and it presents this solemn truth to them in the *then* well-known imagery of Isaiah xiv: 9-15, where those in the grave, as it were in a vast catacomb, are poetically represented as rising to meet the king of Babylon, coming to take his place among them "in the sides of the pit." See also same figure, *Ezekiel*, chapters xxxi-ii. If not a parable, if, on the other hand, a literal narrative of a transaction, on this supposition we are reduced to the absurdity of taking pious, disembodied spirits to Abraham's bosom, not to Christ; of making these *dis-embodied* spirits still to have parts of a body as a bosom, finger, tongue, etc.; and above all, of making Christ flatly contradict the scriptures of the Old Testament, (which, John v: 39, he directs us to search,) in such passages as Job xiv: 21, speaking of the dead—"His sons come to honor and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low but he perceiveth it not of them." Eccl. ix: 5, 6, 10; "The dead know not anything. Also their love and their hatred and their envy is now perished. For there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave, whither thou goest." Aye, Christ himself, echoing the words of the Preacher, declares, "The night cometh, when no man can work;" John ix: 4. See similar statement in Psalms vi: 5, xxxi: 17, lxxxviii: 10-12, cxlvi: 4.

5. Matt. xvii: 3, "And behold, there appeared unto them Moses and Elias talking with him;" (with Jesus at the transfiguration.)

From this, the actual existence of Moses and Elijah as disembodied spirits is inferred. But the transfiguration scene was a representation, a prefiguration of the yet fut-

ure glorious *coming* and *kingdom* of the Messiah; as we learn from the passage which precedes this account in each Evangelist, "there be *some* standing here who shall not taste of death till they *see* the *kingdom* of God;" and also from 2 Peter. i:16, "when we made known unto you the power and *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ; we were *eye witnesses* of His majesty," etc. At the time thus foreshadowed, Moses and Elijah and all saints will have their glorious resurrection bodies, "made like unto His glorious body," (Phil. iii:21.) So we are informed *did* these two actually *appear* at this time: (see account in Luke ix:31, "who appeared '*in glory*,'" and compare Col. iii:4; "*when* Christ, who is our life, *shall appear*, then shall ye also appear with him '*in glory*.'") But though we may suppose that Elijah, at his translation, received his spiritual body, and was changed in a moment, as will be those remaining alive at our Lord's coming; yet Moses did see death, and at this time was sleeping with his fathers, as the Lord had said, Deut. xxxi: 14, 15. We cannot believe him at this time to have been raised from the dead, and to have received his resurrection body, unless we are prepared to contradict Paul's repeated statements that Christ was "the *first* that should rise from the dead," Acts xxvi: 23; that "Christ is the first fruits of them that slept," 1 Cor. xv: 23; that "he is the first born from the dead," Col. i: 18; and also, John's statement that he "is the first-begotten of the dead," Rev. i: 5. Is it not simpler to accept Christ's own explanation when he calls the whole scene a "*vision*,"? (Matt. xix: 9); comparing with this Acts xii: 9, where Luke tells us that Peter, who saw a real angel, and was by him really liberated from prison, "wist not it was true (real)

which was done by the angel, but thought he saw a *vision*."

6. So Rev. vi:9; "I saw under the altar the souls of them that were slain," seen likewise by John in symbolic vision. The word soul here, and also in Rev. xvi:3, xx:4, is plainly used in the sense already sufficiently shown to be the *Biblical*.

7. 1 Thess. v:23; "and the very God of peace sanctify you wholly; and I pray God your whole spirit and soul and body be preserved blameless, unto the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ."

This passage is often thoughtlessly quoted to prove the popular theory, that man is composed of a soul, a spiritual essence, and its material inclosure, the body. But the passage proves too much for that. This precise enumeration of facts, which argues a distinction between soul and body, argues a like distinction between soul and spirit, which two are identical in the popular theology. In fact, on the common view, the Apostle's threefold division here is either an unmeaning repetition of words, or it is simply incomprehensible. Now let us see if, on the Bible view of the soul, we cannot grasp the Apostle's meaning: "May the very God of peace," he says, "sanctify you wholly: and"—the exact Greek is—"may *the whole of you*, the *spirit*, and the *soul*, and the *body*, be preserved blameless in (the original is not 'unto' but *in*) the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Paul prays for the complete blamelessness, in that day of the entire being of each; the spirit, the animating breath of life,—the soul, the organization, capable of being endowed with life and performing its functions,—the body, the material elements which, ever changing, still

by their orderly arrangement go to make up the organization: all, not excepting the body, in the estimation of the Apostle, essential to the very existence of the individual and to the future reward of each.

8. 2 Cor. v. 1-8; "We in this tabernacle * * are willing to be absent from the body," etc. What is this tabernacle? Not the mortal body, as a shell encompassing an immortal something; such is not the language of the Bible; it is the earth, on which, as strangers and pilgrims, we live; dwelling as in a tabernacle, a tent, not in a permanent home. As if to strangle the very conception of a disembodied state, Paul in this very passage declares, "Not that we would be *unclothed* but *clothed upon*, that mortality might be swallowed up of life," as, (see 1 Cor. xv: 54,) it will be at the resurrection. And he is willing, he longs, —what Christian does not?—to be absent from this body with its weariness and its pain, to be clothed upon with his "spiritual body" with which he will "ever be with the Lord;" (1 Thess. iv: 17.)

9. Phil. i: 23; "For I am in a strait betwixt two, having a desire to depart and to be with Christ, which is far better."

Not an exact translation from the Greek, and the "for" is strangely transposed. Literally it is "and I am hard pressed, indeed, by the two [whether to live or die]; (having the earnest desire for the departing and the being with Christ, for *this* is very much better.") An old man, alone in his prison at Rome, he tells us whether to live or die he knows not which to choose, since he is sure he will magnify Christ either way, (verses 20, 22.) It cannot be that in the next breath he will contradict himself and say that

he does well know which he chooses—that his earnest desire (Gr. *epithumian*, elsewhere translated lust,) is to die! And yet there is that he would choose, if he might have it, what?—to depart and be with Christ. When may that be? It is when we are “not unclothed but clothed upon,” when “we are all changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump,” “when mortality is swallowed up of life.” Ah! for that he and we all have “the earnest desire!” “The whole creation (every creature) groaneth and travaileth together in pain until now, waiting for the *manifestation of the sons of God.*” Rom. viii: 23, 19.

10. Luke xx: 37, 38; “Now that the dead are raised even Moses showed at the Bush, when he calleth the Lord the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; for he is not a God of the dead, but of the living; for all live unto him.”

Our modern commentators say that this proves that Abraham and the patriarchs are now living; of course in a disembodied state. Indeed, then the argument would not have ended there; for the Sadducees might have well retorted, “the fact you have proved, that they are now living, by no means proves that they will be raised from the dead; that is another point and the one at issue; prove *that* if you can!” Rev. J. C. Ryle most artlessly thus comments: “The quotation contained in this passage has occasioned much controversy. At first sight it does not appear to be any proof of a resurrection, but only of a life to come.”

And, truly, that is all it is, if the popular theory of disembodied spirits be true. He goes on to say, “One thing is very clear; the argument which our Lord used com-

pletely silenced the Sadducees, and called forth the approbation of the Scribes." And then he adds, in substance,—if we are not convinced, the fault must be in ourselves—we *ought* to be convinced, though we cannot see why! Honest Mr. Ryle, no doubt we ought! To one free from the popular delusion the proof of a resurrection is there, convincingly enough. We need not suppose our Lord so ill-judging, or the wily Sadducees and Pharisees so stupid, as not to know what was or was not proof of a disputed point. Christ's argument is unanswerable, but it is so by virtue of a Biblical premise, which popular theology has lost sight of; viz: **THERE IS NO LIFE FOR THE DEAD WITHOUT A RESURRECTION!** The argument then, is this:

God's words at the bush prove a life for dead patriarchs;

But there is no life for the dead without a resurrection;

Therefore there must be a resurrection: which was to be proved.

In this connection, as Paul's comment on the passage, "all live unto him," read from Rom. iv: 17; "God quickeneth the dead, and calleth those things which be not as though they were."

11. One passage more, 1 Peter iii: 19, 20. "He went and preached unto the spirits in prison, when once the long suffering of God waited in the days of Noah," etc. What does this mean? Where commentators have so differed, shall the writer venture an opinion? To an ordinary reader of the Bible it appears very simple. "Went and preached" is simply "preached;" as in Deut. xxxi: 1; "And Moses *went and spake* (simply spake) these words

unto all Israel:" And, as in Eph. ii:17; "He (Jesus) came and preached peace to you:" he did not come to Ephesus except by his ministers—through them he "preached." The whole passage seems the simple announcement of the fact that the spirits in prison, those who are now represented in the Bible as in the land of darkness, of silence, of unconsciousness, did have the gospel of deliverance, through the coming Lamb of God, preached to them by Noah, when, in the days of that "preacher of righteousness," (2 Pet. ii:5) they were alive and on earth.

Thus have we now examined all the more important passages, whence is drawn at best but the *inference* of man's inherent immortality. Strange indeed, if in a revelation of the Creator's will, so important a doctrine should be left to inference, and never once explicitly stated. How much stranger still, when we learn the unsubstantial basis upon which these inferences rest, and the inconsistencies they involve, if legitimately followed out! Notice again the passage, which of all others is invariably brought up as if to settle all controversy, the promise of Christ to the thief on the cross. The inference hence derived depends entirely upon whether the adverb 'to-day' shall be taken to qualify the verb which proceeds, or that which follows it. We must depart from the common grammatical connection, if we would educe the inference of man's separate spiritual existence, and in so doing, we have found ourselves inevitably brought to the logical conclusion that Christ, whose presence makes Paradise, is not in Paradise! And so in many other passages, apart from the contradictions and absurdities it involves, we observe that the

inference in reality grows out of a precedent belief in the doctrine; in other words, that the inference is built upon the doctrine, not the doctrine upon the inference, which had been supposed to support it.

VI. *All* the passages in the Bible where immortality is verbally expressed, and to whom it appertains.

1 Tim. I : 17—"The King eternal, *immortal*, invisible."

1 Tim. VI : 16—"Who *only* hath *immortality*."

2 Tim. I : 10—"Jesus Christ who hath brought life and *immortality* to light through the gospel."

Rom. II : 7—"To them, who by patient continuance in well doing *seek for* honor, and glory, and *immortality*, [God will render] eternal life."

1 Cor. xv : 53, 54, 57—"For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must PUT ON *immortality*. So when this corruptible shall have put on incorruption, and this mortal shall have put on immortality, then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, Death is swallowed up in victory. Thanks be to God who giveth *us* the victory *through our Lord Jesus Christ*."

Here at last is the well defined Bible statement of immortality. Claimed by the proud philosophers of this world as the inalienable possession of the whole human family, it is by the Divine Giver restricted to those who, by patient continuance in well doing, *seek for it*; and by them received as a gift, it is not to be "put on" until the day when they are invested with the spiritual body, and mortality is swal-

lowed up of life! A future immortality is thus plainly declared to be the *special* portion of the righteous.

VII. Is this Immortality of the righteous revealed in the Old Testament as well as in the New?

Certainly it is, and as such, inseparably associated with the Resurrection. Dan. xii: 2; "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake; some to everlasting life, some to shame and everlasting contempt." Isaiah xxvi: 19; "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dead is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Chap. lv: 8; "Hear, and your soul shall live, and I will make an *everlasting* covenant with you." Psalms xvii: 15; "I shall be satisfied when I awake with thy likeness." Job xiv: 14, 15; "If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come. Thou shalt call and I will answer thee." A future re-living is assumed in the covenant with Abraham, Gen. xiii: 17; "I will give it (the land) unto thee." This promise, it will be observed, is distinct from the promise to his seed, in Gen. xv: 18, 21, where the precise limits of their future possession are defined by the enumeration of the tribes then holding it.

And farther back still, in the story of the Fall itself, is enwrought the promise of future immortality; in the announcement of the Deliverer, the seed of the woman, who should bruise (crush) the serpent's head, and in the cherubim and

the sword of flame, Jehovah's symbol, which kept (*preserved*) the way of the Tree of Life! It is easy to understand how that in the years before the Deluge, while Paradise, lost to the race yet kept for them, still remained, it must have been a constant reminder of that future life, in which the lost Paradise should be regained through the coming deliverer. And after the Flood, the truths connected with that sacred spot, traditionally handed down through the family of Noah, are still evidenced in the sacred tree of the Assyrians, and the cherubic forms of Assyria and Egypt.

A belief in the necessity of the resurrection to a future life, which was, as we have seen, the basis of Christ's argument with the Sadducees, is recognized in the importance the Egyptians attached to embalming the dead, who, as they believed, were one day to be re-called to life. Every Egyptian mummy is a silent witness for our times of that ancient Bible doctrine "No future life without a resurrection!" It is interesting to observe in the early religious belief of this most ancient of peoples, how much of originally revealed truths is preserved even in the midst of so much corruption. We quote from the standard authority of the present day on these subjects: "Although all bodies were to descend into the lower world, they were not, however, all assured of resurrection. To obtain this it was necessary never to have committed any great sin either in act or thought. The deceased was to be judged by Osiris and his forty-two assessors; on this judgment depended the irrevocable lot of the soul. If the deceased was convicted of inexcusable faults, he was decapitated by Horus on the nemma, or block, of Hades. Annihilation was be-

lieved by the Egyptians to be the punishment reserved for the wicked." * From this ancient country arts and literature were brought to the Greeks; and we may readily perceive why their philosophers were led to drop the old, truthful restriction of future life to the good alone, and proclaim it for all; since such a doctrine is more flattering to man's pride, while it the better enabled the priests to to control the masses. But sad it is to see how early this worldly philosophy invaded the churches, notwithstanding Paul's warning against "oppositions of science falsely so called," 1 Tim. vi: 20; until at last the Church as a body came fully to accept as true the serpent's lie, "Ye shall not surely die."

Let it not be thought however, that during all these centuries there have not been a faithful few to protest against this error, but their voices have been lost in the shouts of the multitude, or perchance smothered in the fires of persecution. Witness the following reply to the Romanist, Sir Thomas More, by William Tyndale, that old English translator and student of the Bible, who for his opinions was burned at the stake in 1536. He says, "In putting departed souls in heaven, hell and purgatory, you destroy the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection. What God doth with them that shall we know when we come to them. *The true faith putteth the resurrection, which we be warned to look for every hour.* The heathen philosophers denying *that*, did put that souls did ever live. And the Pope joineth the spiritual doctrine of Christ and the fleshly doctrine of philosophers together—

* ANCIENT HISTORY OF THE EAST, by Lenormant and Chevallier

things so contrary that they cannot agree. And because the fleshly minded Pope consenteth unto heathen doctrine, therefore *he corrupteth the Scriptures to establish it.* If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be, and then what cause is there of the resurrection?"

Immortality for the righteous alone is the truth originally revealed to the race. Is it not time for the church to return to the good old pathos?

VIII. What the Bible teaches as to the portion of the wicked in the future.

Refusing to receive the gift of life through Christ, they inevitably retain their mortal nature, and so we read: Ezek. xviii: 20; "The *soul* that sinneth, it shall *die*," referring to the second death, the penalty of one's own sin. James i: 15; "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth *death*." Phil. iii: 18, 19; "Many walk of whom I have told you often and and tell you now, even weeping; whose end is destruction." Acts iii: 23; "Every soul who will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people." Matt. x: 28; "Fear him who is able to destroy both soul and body in hell," (gehenna). Psalm xxxviii: 10; "For yet a little while and the wicked shall not be." 2 Peter ii: 2; "They shall utterly perish." Malachi iv: 1; "For behold the day cometh that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble; and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch." 2

Thess. i: 9; "They shall be punished with everlasting destruction;"—an everlasting punishment.

It is objected by some that the expression "everlasting punishment" (Matt. xxv: 46) must involve the eternal existence of the punished, so that they may be eternally tormented; that a punishment cannot be everlasting unless everlastingly felt by a conscious object. But the fallacy of this is most apparent. What is the punishment? Death, the loss of life. Is this loss, which is the punishment, everlasting? It is. Then plainly the punishment is everlasting; and the point is granted. No question of this kind would ever arise but for our un-Biblical conception of the meaning of the word soul. An eternal punishment is not necessarily *eternally punishing*, any more than "eternal judgment" (Heb. vi: 2) is eternally judging, or "eternal redemption" (Heb. ix: 12) is eternally redeeming. From the death to which, as the result of Adam's sin, all are liable, there is a resurrection; from the second death, which is the consequence of our own sin, there is no resurrection—it is an "everlasting destruction," as the apostle styles it.

The term "unquenchable fire," Matt. iii: 12; "He will *burn up* the chaff with unquenchable fire," is thought to contradict the idea of a literal destruction; but, it confirms it. In common language, we call that fire unquenchable which could not be put out till it had wholly destroyed the object of its fury. So in the language of the Bible, (Jer. xvii: 27) "I will kindle a fire in the gates thereof, and it shall devour the palaces of Jerusalem, and it *shall not be quenched*." This was fulfilled as (Lam. iv: 2) the same prophet testifies: "The Lord hath kindled a fire in Zion, and it hath devoured the foundations thereof:" yet that un-

quenchable fire is not still burning. So of the expression "the worm never dies, and the fire is not quenched," Mark ix: 44. The worm dies not, the fire is not quenched before its work is completed. And upon whom does the worm and the fire feed? Compare Isaiah LXVI: 24; whence the illustration is taken: "And they shall go forth and look upon *the carcasses* of the men that have sinned against me, for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched."

Much is made of the language of Rev. xiv: 11; "The smoke of their torment ascendeth up for ever and ever." It is hardly worth while to argue with one, who permits the figurative imagery of this highly symbolic book to override the plain language of other parts of Scripture. Let such a one read Isaiah xxxiv: 10; whence no doubt is borrowed the figure of the passage in Revelations. The prophet, speaking of the Lord's judgments upon the land of Idumea, declares, "it shall not be quenched night or day; the smoke shall go up forever." No traveler now-a-days finds in the present condition of ancient Idumea, an exact fulfillment, of Isaiah's poetic prediction. Desolate indeed is that land, totally ruined are its cities, but—they are not sending up now the smoke of their burning. And yet the poet-seer is not found a false prophet. The doom which in the highly wrought language of poetry, he foretold, has overtaken those proud cities. In plainer prose, it was, it is, unending destruction.

Again, it is claimed by the advocates of eternal torment, that whenever the death of the soul is spoken of, it must be taken figuratively, because, say they, the soul cannot die; therefore, when the Bible says it does die, when it threatens

death to the soul as the penalty of sin, it must mean not death, but eternal life in misery. But such forget what we have already noted, how often the word of God speaks of the death of souls by the sword or other violence, using the word or idea of death beyond question, in its literal sense, as the cessation of existence. See, already quoted, Josh. x: 28-39, xi: 11. It is very easy to bring forward a lengthy list of examples of the figurative use of the words death, destroy, and the like, and then to *infer* a like figurative use when the punishment of the wicked is announced, but such arguing *proves* nothing. No one questions but that these and kindred words are at times so used; but when so used, that fact is, and must be made most apparent, else the reader is hopelessly confused by the ambiguity of the language. In such cases, either the individual spoken of is recognized as being alive, or some qualifying phrase is added, as "dead in trespasses and sins." Besides, the terms of a law is the last place in which to look for figurative language. Words there can only be used in their primary, literal meaning. If death is threatened, death in its primary sense is meant, the cessation of existence. This rule of human jurisprudence admits of no departure therefrom; are we to believe the Judge of all the earth less explicit in stating his laws? No! we must interpret the legal documents of the Bible as we do all others: *their language is to be taken in its strictest literal sense, unless there can be no question but that it is figurative.*

IX. From the preceding investigations we obtain the following results :

We learn that in the Bible, our only standard of truth in these matters, the word SOUL is used to denote a material organized being ; and though generally used of such when endowed with vitality, it is also used of the same when life has departed. The Bible uses the word soul, then, in its primary meaning, to denote THE MATERIAL ORGANIZATION: in other words, it denotes matter organized so as to be susceptible of life. The Bible applies the term equally to men and to animals, and the existence of such beings depends upon the integrity of this organization. Hence the term is also used in the abstract to denote the vitality or life-principle itself of such living beings. To repeat: the word soul, in the Bible, means primarily the animal *organization* ; as its secondary meaning, we find it denotes not infrequently the *life* of all earthly creatures. The fact is explicitly stated that such beings are formed of material elements, and no account whatever is found in the Biblical writings of anything beyond this entering into their composition. The language of the inspired apostle in 1 Cor. xv: 45, 47, is most decisive on this point. He states the first man, Adam, was made a living *soul*, Gr. *psuche*: then he describes this first man as being (in the Greek) *psuch-ikon*, we may translate *psuch-ical*, or to coin a corresponding English word, *soul-ical*. And this so designated "*soul-ical*" being, he declares is "*ek ges*," of *earth, earthy* ! If this be materialism, so let it be. It is the materialism of the Bible, and rests upon an authority which man can

not assail. "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherd of the earth; wo to him that striveth with his Maker! Shall the *clay* say to Him that fashioned it, what makest thou?" Isaiah XLV: 19.

Man, a living soul of such a nature, does not then possess immortality by his creation. It can be his, only as a special gift from his Maker. As a consequence of Adam's sin (1 Cor. xv: 22 *), being begotten in his image, (Gen. v: 3,) he dies, and ceasing to exist, "in that very day his thoughts perish." (Ps. CXLVI: 4.) But the Creator keeps for him his life in His remembrance, and at His "appointed time" restores that life at the resurrection, raising him up again with his old emotions, habits of thought, and history, in fact the same individual as before. Then the question, whether he shall have eternal life or not, is forever decided according to the deeds already done in the body. Those whose names are found written in the book of life, who have in this world accepted the gift of God, eternal life, then "put on immortality," and live forever with their Redeemer. Those who have rejected the same free gift, who have chosen in this world of probation to live as brutes, shall perish as such; they will suffer the capital punishment of God's tribunal, the second or eternal death, attended with such degrees of pain, as, apart from the recognition of their own folly, a wise and holy God may see fit to inflict.

Is this the belief laid down for us in the Bible? Each one must judge for himself. The writer, with a conviction deepening with continued investigation, claims that it is. Is it the belief of Christendom generally? No, indeed.

* "In Adam all die"—that death is not the *punishment* of their sin.

Why not? Because that Satan, the prince of this present world, has for centuries blinded the eyes of the church to the truth. How sad to recognize from the letters of our departed Saviour to the Seven Churches, (Rev. II: III:) that ere the last of the Apostles was called to his rest, Satan had already begun to corrupt the truth he could not destroy. Nor did his malign influence then cease. Let any one read of the Christian dissensions on points of doctrine in the subsequent centuries; of the sad conformity to the world, the cringing to its philosophers and potentates; of the fierce discussions of the great Christian councils, and of decrees obtained by finesse and force rather than by moral means; of the ever advancing corruption of the Romish Church, and the almost eclipse of truth during the dark ages; all show the fearful power of the Evil one. To be sure, Luther brought back to the Church the cardinal truth, "the just shall live by faith," rather than by works, but was that great reformation an entire casting out of error from that portion of the Church it reached? Even the great reformer himself, so strong the force of early belief, could never emancipate himself from the error of transubstantiation. Was there not still left in the Church that underlying error, derived from the philosophy of this world, of a natural immortality for all? and to this dogma is not our interpretation of the Bible itself made to bend? This is the question before us, a question to be decided not by tradition, not by submitting to any human authority, however unexceptionable, but by a prayerful, independent study of the volume of God's revealed will.

X. Granting that the Bible teaches the mortal nature and death of Souls, except as Christ redeems the righteous; what advantage has this over the popular belief?

If we have recognized the fact that the Bible teaches it, that itself is answer enough. But to specify in detail:

1. *It exalts the character of God.* It exalts His *power* in that Sin will not be eternal. God will obtain a final victory over it, and root it from his dominions. Christ will "destroy the works of the devil;" not, as "upholding all things by the word of his power," will he perpetuate the devil's work through the coming ages.

It exalts the *justice* of God. Few thinking men now-a-days will be found sufficiently venturesome to argue for eternal torment on any basis of justice. The sins of a finite life, which is but a moment to eternity, cannot deserve infinite, because unending, torture. And certainly such excess of punishment cannot be passed over to the account of the future as a retribution for sins then occurring, for in that hypothetical hell, the wicked *can do nothing but sin*. Besides, Scripture declares that the future punishment is for "the deed done in the body." 2 Cor. v:10.

It exalts the *love* of our Father, God. Not willing (wishing) that any should perish, He offers to all eternal life thro' his crucified Son. Those who reject such free love shall forever lose their life in such a manner as shall best express God's abhorrence of sin; but our merciful God will not keep them in being to *torment* them forever. It endears

the Redeemer to the redeemed, as they learn that their very existence to all eternity they will owe to his dying love.

2. *It exalts the Bible in our estimation.* It renders it more readily intelligible and consistent with itself, and it thus enhances the pleasure and profit of studying it. By the common method of interpretation, the reader is surprised to find that many parts of the Bible are not written in the language of common life. For example, Gen. III: 17, 19; "Because *thou* (the man, not the passive body) hast done this, in the sweat of thy brow shalt *thou* (the man) eat bread, till *thou* (the body!) return unto the ground," or in ordinary language it should be expressed, "till *not* thou, but thy body returns to the ground." We hardly believe that, in any language, the pronoun "thou," in the same sentence can be addressed to two radically different things!

Again, as commonly interpreted, it is very strange that Christ and his apostles speak of our future destiny in terms to say the least, so confusing. That our Saviour, in his conversations with common people in John's gospel, should designate the future eternal life of the wicked as death, at the very same time using the word death also in its ordinary acceptation, is an enigma. Formerly, in careful study as a Sabbath School superintendent with his teachers, the writer could then only explain it by supposing that Christ purposely spoke ambiguously, that there might be more occasion for the exercise of pure faith.

And again, on the current view it is strange that Christ should refer so exclusively to the resurrection as the time of reward, and that the theme of the Apostles should be "Jesus and the *Resurrection*"; since the latter is a comparatively insignificant matter, if departed saints are already in

glory. These difficulties, and others like them, which many a thinking mind has felt, disappear if, freed from the trammels of a religious training, we take the words of inspiration according to their literal signification.

It should be noted that sometimes the ambiguity is not found in the original text, but is caused by the translators' choice of words. May it be hinted that perhaps these good men thought it their duty to make, if possible, the Bible teach those theological views they thought it ought. For instance in John xi: 26, Jesus says, "He that liveth and believeth on me shall *never die*." But the believer does die, he, no more than any other, is exempt from the first death. It must mean then, you reason, the second death; but why did not Christ say *which* he referred to? *He* did! The Greek is, he shall not, not (two negatives in Greek more emphatic,) die, 'eis ton aion', to the aeon, to eternity; i. e. literally "the believer shall not indeed die eternally." So John viii: 51, translated "he shall never see death," is "he shall not indeed see death to eternity," he shall not see the eternal death.

It seems a duty, to call special attention to the no doubt well meant, but unjustifiable, efforts of King James' translators to make their version teach the doctrine, that man has a soul which animals have not. The Hebrew word, 'nepheah' soul, when referring to man they were willing to translate literally; but when the same is used of animals, that fact they must by all means cover up by substituting some other word. We have seen that the Hebrew 'living soul,' Gen. ii: 7; since it is applied to man, is given literally; but for the same Hebrew words in Gen. i: 20 and 30, where animals are spoken of, we have the English word

'*life*.' Observe further that for the same Hebrew in Gen. i; 21, 24; ii: 19, we have instead 'living creatures.' We have noted that for dead *soul* in the Hebrew of Numb. vi: 6; ix: 6, 7, 10, the translators have substituted dead *body*. In Leviticus xi: 10, we read, "all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers of all that move in the waters, and of any 'living thing' which is in the waters;" here 'living *thing*' is given us for 'living soul.' Once indeed in the Old Testament, the translators seem unable to avoid using the word *soul* in its Biblical application to beasts. We read, Numb. xxxi: 28, as the Lord's tribute of the booty taken in battle: "one *soul* of five hundred, both of the *persons*, and of the *beeves*, and of the *asses*, and of the *sheep*. And once in the New, we have; "Every living *soul* died *in the sea*."

Look at this fact: Six times in the first and second chapters of Genesis does the Hebrew 'living soul' occur; *once* it refers to man, and it is then expressed in our version: *five times* it refers to animals of all kinds, and that fact is carefully concealed from the English reader. Such artifice may be overlooked in men trained to believe the Popish maxim, "the end justifies the means." But it were inexcusable now, and it is to be hoped that the promised new revision will have the courage to give us the literal truth.

One who has not given the subject attention, can hardly realize how great confusion of thought and language is encountered, in the endeavor to reconcile the doctrine of inherent immortality with the plain statements of the Bible. For example, study the bearing of this doctrine upon the accepted theory of death. Let us analyze the view it presents of the first and of the second death.

The two deaths, you would say, should certainly resemble each other. Two things of the same name, and designated the first, the second, ought to be enough alike to belong to the same class. Now how much resemblance is there on the common theory?

According to that, 'the first death' of a wicked man is *not* to him a cessation of existence; although that is the primary meaning of the word death, and the idea involved in all its secondary meanings, as given by Webster: it is the separation, the tearing asunder, of two parts of his complex being. As a result of this, one part decays, loses its organization, and so ceases to exist: the other part continues to exist in unspeakable torment. At last comes the Resurrection, when that part, which passed out of existence, is again brought into being, and the suffering part is united to it. But no! do we understand that the body, which is all that has a resurrection on this theory, can be brought into being at such a time? It is not imperishable; it could not endure the unending torture before it. This hypothesis then must presume that it also is changed and made immortal, like the bodies of the righteous; although no warrant in Scripture is found for this, and that change for the righteous, the putting on of immortality, their bodies made "like unto His glorious body," is spoken of as "the gift of God through our Lord Jesus Christ:" 1 Cor. xv: 54, 57. Does He indeed bestow the same gift upon the wicked?

But if we accept this unwarranted supposition, what then? The two parts re-united appear before the judgment seat: they or the individual is judged according to the deeds of the life on earth: the verdict of condemna-

tion is pronounced, and the second death is now inflicted; 2 Cor. v: 10; Rev. xx: 11-15; xxi: 8. Now does this second death resemble the first? Not at all: the two parts of the man are *not* torn asunder again, but on the contrary, joined together they are cast into that torment which, on this theory, one part has long been enduring without even the formality of a trial. We might stop here and inquire what the need of the Judgment on a question already irrevocably decided; and why this apparently needless restoring of the body?

But the point is this: when comparing the first with the second death, we find no analogy whatever between the act of tearing asunder two parts of a being, and the act of casting into torment the two re-united. And to these two entirely different processes, are we to believe that the word of God applies the same term, and, as if the latter were a repetition of the former, even designates them, number one, number two? Surely, we cannot attribute such inconsistency of language to the All-wise!

An advocate of the popular theory may seek to evade our conclusions by objecting to the definition of the first death, as already given. He may claim that it is not the simple separation of the two parts of a man, but that it also necessarily involves the idea of suffering in the part still existing. In that case, he confounds the result of dying with the death itself. And, if the idea of future suffering be essential to the conception of death, then, since Christians are not thus to suffer, they cannot die. But, though poetry may utter such fancies, observation and the Bible declare they do die. "In Adam all die."

But it may be claimed that the popular definition should be more exactly stated; that the first death embraces the separation of the two parts of man, *together with* the consequences to the part still living, according as the previous life had been a righteous or a wicked one. If this be correct, not only have we the before mentioned confounding of results with that whence they proceed; but if death be not only the setting free the living part, but also the results that follow, the actual carrying of it, for the righteous, to inconceivable bliss, how can Paul (1 Cor. xv: 26) call death their "last enemy," and speak of it (3 Cor. i: 10, 11; Phil. ii: 27) as a thing they should pray to be delivered from? Such an evident absurdity forces us back to our previous statement, that the popular theory defines the first death to be simply the separation of two parts of a human being.

Surely a theory, leading to such inconsistencies and contradictions, cannot be part of that revelation which God gave to mankind. It needs but to be carefully scrutinized, and tested by God's Word, to have its pretensions totally refuted and rejected. But if we take the word "death" in its literal meaning, as the cessation of existence; the first death terminating at the Resurrection, the second, a like cessation of existence, but unending, eternal; then the previous obscurity and contradictions vanish, and we perceive that the Bible is throughout in harmony with itself.

And so, not a few of the questions which still perplex the Christian world would be set at rest, if first all disputants would agree to take the language of the Bible in its literal sense. Who that acknowledges literal death as the penalty of sin, finds any question in regard to the Atonement of Christ, whether or not he was a strictly Vicarious sacrifice?

And so of other disputed points. The Reformer, Luther, well observes (*Annotat. in Deut.*), "That which I have so often insisted on elsewhere, I here once more repeat, viz: that the Christian should direct his first efforts toward understanding the literal sense (as it is called) of the Scripture, which alone is the substance and the faith of Christian theology. * * The allegorical [figurative] sense is commonly uncertain, and by no means safe to build our faith upon, for it usually depends on human opinion and conjecture only. Therefore Origen, and Jerome, and similar of the fathers are to be avoided. For later writers, unhappily following their too much praised and prevailing example, it has come to pass that men make just what they please of the Scriptures, until some accommodate the Word of God to the most extravagant absurdities."

That the literal interpretation of God's word conduces to its better understanding, cannot be better demonstrated than by adducing a fact from the writer's own observation. A theological professor lecturing to his class upon heaven; as the glorious abode of saints already departed, when he came to consider Acts II:34, "For David is not ascended into the heavens," frankly confessed, "I do not understand it." While admiring his candor, we can but exclaim—Not understand it! He should have understood it. It was spoken not to a company of metaphysicians and deep thinkers, but to the common people. It was an important step in an argument which convinced three thousand of the truth of Jesus' claim to the Messiahship. No doubt they were more familiar with the Old Testament, which was all they had, than are we, but for us, with the additional light of the New Testament, not to understand the passage, is noways credit-

able, to say the least. What is the key to its comprehension? Simply this: take the passage literally, acknowledge that it means just what it says, and all is plain. If it contradicts your cherished theories, throw them, not God's Word, aside!

8. This right understanding of the Bible will *insure a proper presentation of the terrors of the Lord*, of which we hear so little from the pulpit at the present day. God is a God of love, and we are glad to learn that; but he is also a God to be feared by evil doers; we need to learn that. He is terrible to his adversaries! When he would bring the Israelites out of Egypt, and make of them a people to his name, he must first enforce this lesson. And well he did: in the judgments of Egypt, in the terrors of Mount Sinai. "The sight of the glory of the Lord was like devouring fire on the top of the mount in the eyes of the children of Israel."—Ex. xxiv: 17. And once, at least, in their desert history, did they behold that fire leap forth from the enshrouding cloud to devour the rebellious. The fear of the Lord was to them the beginning of wisdom. Terror is needed to awaken, and then, love, to draw. One-sided is now the preaching of the ministry—they shun to declare the whole counsel of God. But none need hesitate to announce the final, literal destruction of wicked men; it is not repugnant to our reason and sense of justice, as is the abhorrent doctrine of eternal torment.

4. The truth of a literally interpreted Bible *utterly subverts the growing tendency to Universalism*. If the dogma "All souls are immortal" be a tenet of the Bible, then logically, from the Word of God, you prove both the eternal torment and the universal salvation of the wicked! How

otherwise, according to that dogma, can we interpret Eph. i: 10, "that he might gather together in one all things in Christ, both which are in heaven, (Gr. in the heavens*) and on earth," except that the wicked are all finally to be pardoned, whether they will or no? And so of Col. i: 20, and Acts. iii: 21. And where then is Christ's explicit word, "everlasting punishment?" The rejection of this dogma of inherent immortality alone furnishes the solution of the difficulty. Acts iii: 23; "Every soul that will not hear that prophet, *shall be destroyed* from among the people." Sin and the agents of sin will disappear together, and the surviving redeemed will be "*One in Christ.*"

5. In like manner is the tendency to *Infidelity* repressed. Men are not by it driven off into Infidelity, repelled by hard, untruthful presentations of our loving Father, or disgusted with contradictory interpretations of His Holy Word.

6. The rejection of natural immortality gives us the vantage ground in contests with *the errors of Romanism*. If we stand with them in their belief in the conscious existence of the deceased, how can we logically condemn the invocation of dead saints, which grows into worship of the same? "May we not," they say, "ask a friend on earth to pray to God for us?" Yes, certainly. "And since David says, 'If I regard iniquity in my heart, the Lord will not hear me,' then the holier and freer from sin that friend, the more should we ask his intercession?" Yes. "Then if that friend is now perfectly holy, and in the immediate presence of God, why should I not all the more ask him still to pray for me, since there is no precept in the Bible which forbids

* See similar Greek of Eph. vi: 12: translated "high places," and referring to evil spirits.

it?" But take away that dogma upon which their religion is founded, in its worship of the dead Virgin Mary and other saints, and in its doctrine of purgatory, and the whole fabric of corruption falls to the ground.

So with the absurdities of *Spiritualism*, and so with *Mormonism*, professing to be based upon the revelations of certain golden plates, brought to the knowledge of its founder by some departed saint; so also with the vagaries of *Swedenborgianism*, which seem to be a blossoming out of the orthodox method of allegorically or spiritually interpreting the words of Scripture. Each alike read their death warrant in a literally interpreted Bible.

7. Not alone in the encounter with these false religions, but also in the *work of Missions* generally, this reformed belief would be found most helpful. It puts the missionary at a fearful disadvantage to be compelled to tell, for instance, an intelligent Hindoo: "The true God whom I declare unto you, offers to make *you* eternally happy; but your father, and all your ancestors, because, as you confess, they did wrong, although not at the time realizing their peril, He is now tormenting, and will to all eternity." "How can I be sure," he may well reply, "that such is the true God? We have our Juggernaut who delights in the blood of victims. I will take my chance with the millions who have gone before me." He has not had the opportunity to read the plain words of Holy Writ; "As I live, saith the Lord, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked."—Ezek. xxxiii: 11. And if he did, would it outweigh the statement of the missionary, backed as it is by the voice of Christendom? Nothing but the religion of Christ could have stood this strain, which man has put upon

it! But let the missionary be able to say, "I bring you glad tidings of a life to come, to be obtained only through a living Saviour. For your parents this good news has come too late; they have lost that life; but at the resurrection, God will not punish them above what they deserve." The thought of their second death, with its attendant pain of dying, mercifully graduated according to their guilt, he can endure; but he cannot bear the thought of their suffering to all eternity. Such a message brings hope to him, without the accompaniment of unending despair and woe for his loved ones.

8. Still another recommendation of this doctrine is that it teaches us *rightly to estimate the body*. The popular idea of man's soul and body is that the soul is the higher part, the man proper, which is imprisoned and cramped within the body, and is unable fully to exercise its powers until released from this imprisonment. An unfortunate sequel to this anticipated liberty is the inevitable resurrection, at which time we must return to our prison, and though beautified and improved, it is to be our prison eternally. No wonder with such ideas, we hear so little in Christian conversation, prayers, or sermons of what was to early Christians, a prominent topic, the Resurrection. Hear Paul, as before the Sanhedrim he says: (Acts xxii: 7,) "Of the hope and resurrection of the dead I am called in question." Before Agrippa he expands this thought of the resurrection: (Acts xxvi: 6, 7,) "And now I stand and am judged for the hope of the promise made of God unto our fathers; unto which hope our twelve tribes, instantly serving God night and day, hope to come." No, indeed, the poetic fancy that the body is a clog, a hindrance, is found in

heathen philosophy and in hymn-books, not in the Bible. That gives no warrant for this strange degrading of our bodies and of material things, which to many seems almost vital to the existence of religion itself. When at the completion of his material creation, God surveyed his work, he pronounced it, "very good." And though we are so weakened and debilitated by sin, yet the Psalmist could say: "*I will praise Thee, for I am fearfully and wonderfully made;*" Psalm cxxxix: 14; (referring, certainly not to the construction of a hypothetical soul, for of that he could know no more than do the theologians of our day.) Our life in this world is in the *body*: when the Bible speaks of living again, it is in the *body*; for the Saints, a glorified body; "there is a natural body and there is a *spiritual body*;" 2 Cor. xv: 44: "Jesus is the Saviour of the body;" Eph. v: 28. He will redeem us from all infirmity in the future life, and make us immortal.

And above all, the human organism that we so disparage and condemn, how highly has it been honored and what bright gleams of future glory are reflected upon it in the marvelous fact, that "the WORD was made FLESH!" John i: 14. "He being in the form of God, thought it not robbery (Gr. *Harpagmon*, freely translated, "a thing to be grasped and retained" as a robber his prey) to be equal with God, but * * was made in the likeness of men, and being found in fashion as a man, he became obedient unto death." Phil. ii: 6, 8; And now having risen from the dead "in fashion as a man," he has entered, as our High Priest into the Holiest of all, "to appear in the presence of God for us; and unto them that look for him shall he appear [*in like manner*," Acts i: 11,] the second time unto salvation:"

Heb. ix: 24-23. Then as he takes his promised, everlasting dominion, King of kings and Lord of lords, it is in human form still, that "the SON OF MAN shall sit upon the throne of His glory." Matt. xxv: 31.

Thus doth God honor and exalt our material organism; and yet the simple Christian, who reverences his Bible, and accepts its literal statement that the soul is formed of material elements, is stigmatised as a materialist, as if that were almost an infidel! Read again Gen. ii: 7; "The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul." The breath of life, we learn from Gen. vii: 21, 22, is an attribute of all animals, therefore, "breathing the breath of life into" means, simply He made the man to live; that is, he became a *living* soul, who before was a *dead* soul, as in the Hebrew of Numbers vi: 6, and ix: 6, 7, 10. *Who* became a *living* soul? Man formed of the dust of the ground, of *matter*. Hear the words of the Preacher, (Eccl. iii: 20,) "All (man and beast) are of the dust, and shall turn to dust again." Is the writer of Ecclesiastes an inspired Materialist? David says, Psalm ciii: 4; "He knoweth our frame," and, result of this knowledge, "he remembereth that *we are dust*." And again the Psalmist, says: (Psalm xxx: 9) "When *I* go down to the pit (grave), shall the *dust* praise Thee" (that is, then *I* shall be but dust); "shall *it* praise Thee?" Rather materialistic language this, from the sweet singer of Israel! If the Bible does not teach a material nature for the soul, what does it teach? Surely not the immaterialism of the present day. Either that is in error, or the Bible is.

What is now the practical value of such reformation of our views on this point? When we behold the marvelous skill with which God has constructed this material frame, and how highly he has honored it, even taking its nature upon Himself, certainly we can but highly esteem that which stands so high in the estimation of its Maker. If we believe that it is not a vile case or prison, which invests our independent and noble self, but that man is the organism, and upon the integrity of his organization his existence depends, then shall we care for and cherish it, as we have but little thought of doing heretofore. Accepting as the literal truth, Eccl. ix: 10, "that there is no work or wisdom in the grave," not only shall we be more in earnest "to do with our might what our hand findeth to do" here, but we shall see to it, that by proper care the organism is well fitted for its work. Parents and teachers will not neglect the physical training for the mental, but will be zealous to carry out the maxim which experience, in spite of theory, teaches us—"mens sana in corpore sano"—a sound mind is found in a sound body! Laws of health will thus be accepted as vital to our welfare. It will be acknowledged that indulgence of the appetites, excess in eating and drinking is not only sin but folly; it is a sin against our own existence, a sin against the soul. And so of any of the sinful indulgences of youth, which the world styles the harmless "sowing of wild oats." As Peter enjoins us: "Abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against *the soul*," against your very existence in this world as well as the future. 1 Peter ii: 11. And Wisdom's warning is, "He that sinneth against Me, *wrongeth his own soul*: all that hate Me love death;" Prov. viii: 36.

So also, the high, Bible estimate of *long-life*, which is borne out by the universal sentiment of mankind, we are now able to understand. So marked is this conception in the Old Testament that many have fallen into the error, as we have shown it to be, of supposing that its promises and rewards do not extend beyond the present life. And this universal clinging to life has no doubt greatly disturbed many a Christian, as he mistakenly grieves to find that this life has so strong a hold on his heart. But, though for Christ's people the sting of death has been taken away, yet, unless it comes to us as it did to Abraham, an old man and full of years, it is an enemy still; it robs us of that existence we otherwise might have had. Not only may the Christian cling to life, he *may*, he *should* take every right means to preserve it. Hezekiah's mourning at the announcement of his impending death, and his subsequent rejoicing when fifteen years were added to him, (Isaiah xxxviii:) is perfectly natural and right. But on the popular theory, that death is but a summons into the immediate presence of his God and the superior bliss of heaven, how unmanly, how faithless, his reluctance! David (Psalm xxx:) prays and expostulates that he might be returned to health, and praises God that his prayer was heard. Now if, on the popular theory, the continuance of earthly life must defer the heavenly, could he honestly say in Ps. xvii: 15, "I shall be *satisfied when* I awake in thy likeness?" Paul in the new dispensation fully agrees with these Old Testament Saints, when he says of Ephaphoditus, his companion in labor, Phil. ii: 26; "Indeed he was sick nigh unto death, but God had mercy on him," (that is, must we suppose; in that he did not take him to heaven! Query,

then, how much did he want to go?) So Paul says of himself, 2 Cor. 1: 10, "Who delivered us from so great a death," (as that threatened at Ephesus,) "*and doth deliver*," is still delivering us from death in general; "in whom we trust He will yet (still) deliver us, ye also helping together by prayer for us." Yet this is the Paul, who, in the same epistle, our Translators would have us believe, thus declares it a special mercy not to die, and at the same time longs to die! (Phil. 1: 27, and 1: 23.)

A singular story in the popular view, is that of Moses' death with its attendant circumstances. He had been forbidden to go into Canaan, and sorely grieved does he show himself by the prohibition. Four times in his recorded addresses to the Children of Israel does he allude to it; (Deut. 1: 37, III: 23-27, IV: 21, 22, XXXI: 2) telling how he had besought the Lord that he might go over and might "*see* the good land," till the Lord forbade him to "*speak more of this matter*;" promising him, however, a distant view of Canaan from the mountains of Moab. And so we read in the last of Deuteronomy, how he went up to Pisgah's top, and there the Lord showed him the land of promise. Now if, Moses' desire was really to *see* the land his people were to possess, why did the Lord promise him this sight, and then take him to the mountain top and kindly point out to him the localities, if on the popular theory, Moses was just about to have so much better, (if we may reverently say,) a bird's eye view of the whole land from the heavenly heights? No, the bitterness of Moses' disappointment, and the scene on Pisgah's height, are utterly at variance with the popular theory. Yet it is perfectly intelligible, if we accept literally the Lord's words to Moses, (Deut. XXXI: 16) "*Thou shalt*

sleep with thy fathers." He could not with spirit vision follow the Israelites in their passage through Jordan and in the future conquests. He could not be near, as modern theology suggests, 'probably,' as a ministering spirit to those whom he had once loved and cared for. The language of Job must henceforth apply to him—"His children come to honor and he knoweth it not; they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them." Can we believe that the Lord's language, in the personal conversation just quoted, "*thou shalt sleep with thy fathers,*" really means, "*Thy body shall sleep with thy fathers' bodies!*" Or, when Abraham is spoken of as *gathered to his people*, (Gen. xxv: 8;) does it mean that his soul has gone to be with theirs, when Holy Writ tells us, (Josh. xxiv: 2,) that they were idolators?

9. A general recognition of the soul's natural mortality and the adoption of the literal method of interpreting the Scriptures which that involves, *will surely bring to us the long sought Christian unity.*

The existence of so many denominations, whatever mitigations there may be of the evil, is a sad reproach to our Christianity. Infidels take occasion to decry our faith, and the inexcusable ambiguity of its standard, which is understood in so many different ways. Christians mourn over the needless expenditure of denominational force, and the animosity and rivalries between those whose great duty it is to love one another. Christ prayed that his people may be one, and the answer to that prayer, though long delayed, must yet come.

What is the cause of this diversity? Note the answer. It has its origin in the acceptance by the church of the

philosophical, unscriptural dogma of the soul's inherent immortality. To sustain this, which is to all appearance explicitly denied in so many passages of Holy Writ, we must search out some allegorical or figurative meaning, which we believe lies hidden in such passages. And thus license is given to interpret the whole Book by the same allegorical standard, as may best suit the wishes of different men. The literal meaning can be but one: The figurative varies according to the bent of each individual mind.

What is the remedy? A simple and yet a radical one. However much it may conflict with their theories, let all Christians consent to take every passage of Holy Scripture, as of other writings, in the ordinary use and meaning of the language in which it is written, except where such is unquestionably figurative. Then the Bible will everywhere agree with itself, and Christians likewise will then everywhere agree with one another. Shall we thus consent to do our part towards the fulfilment of Christ's prayer, or shall we still continue to make it and His word "void through our tradition?"

10. Finally, to the individual Christian, not the least recommendation of the Bible doctrine of the soul, is the fact, that like all Scripture truth, *it tends to develop personal holiness.*

"Be not conformed to this world;" "come out from among them and be ye separate," saith the Lord to "his people" whom He would "purify unto himself, a peculiar people zealous of good works." But how is it with the church the present day? So far below the apostolic standard and example, that were Christ now to come, would he not ask of many, "What do ye more than others?"

Why is the prevailing type of piety so low? We know it is "through the deceitfulness of sin;" Heb. III: 13. In the moulding of Christian character, that original lie of the Arch-deceiver still exerts its baleful influence. Each one, who believes that if he sin, he "will not surely die," for immortality is his by virtue of his creation, is too ready to think that a God of mercy will not condemn an immortal being to endless torment, if only in this life He can obtain the slightest semblance of yielding to his authority. And the formal act of acknowledging the supremacy of Jehovah, by uniting with his visible church, seems sufficient to fulfill such condition.

But the Bible, what saith it on this point? Those who, *by patient continuance in well-doing*, seek for eternal life, they shall inherit immortality. Even Paul, toward the close of that wonderful life of self sacrifice could say, (Phil. III: 11,) "If by any means (if possibly) I may attain unto the resurrection of the dead:" attain to that '*Anastasis*,' the resurrection *from out* the dead ones, "the first resurrection" of those who shall not be hurt of the second death. For this will he yet strive and press forward in the race, to reach the prize, that gift of God, eternal life. It is those that are *worthy*, Christ says, that shall walk with Him in white; Rev. III: 4.

God is now choosing out of the Gentiles, a people for His name, (Acts xv: 14,) to whom He will give life through Christ, the Quickener. To these who shall be "accounted worthy to attain that world, the children of God, the children of the resurrection," (Luke xx: 35, 36,) to them in addition "shall be given the Kingdom, and the dominion, and the greatness of the Kingdom under the whole heaven;" Dan.

VII: 27. For such high stations of honor and usefulness, God will not accept of any whose character will not stand the test of its trial here. He is not under obligation, as we have been virtually taught, to glorify us, or else to torment us forever. Those found not worthy, He "will blot out their names out of the book of life; an "everlasting destruction," "leaving neither root nor branch."

How solemn the thought: Moulding our characters here day by day, as death finds us, so must we be in character, when, at the great day, God restores to us "the breath of life." "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; he that is righteous, let him be righteous still." Rev. xxii: 11. "As the tree falleth, so shall it lie." Ever near is that solemn moment! The true doctrine of the soul teaches, that to the individual his next *conscious* moment after death is the Resurrection morning. Death may befall us at any moment. Ah! on this view, how close the Judgment day attends upon our steps. "Behold the Judge standeth before the door!" Watch ye! watch ye! is continually ringing in our ears: give all diligence to make your calling and election sure! For, it is the word of the Master, "Not every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven."

XI. Objections commonly urged against this Doctrine.

1. It is objected that this is the doctrine of Annihilation, and that since there is no such word in the Bible, nor such fact known to modern science, which denies the absolute annihilation of matter, therefore, the inference that these views are sustained by ignoring Science, and dishonestly perverting the Bible. Religious discussions have ever been noted for their un-Christ-like bitterness, and in this instance it is sad to observe how general and persistent has been the endeavor to excite prejudice against these views. An elaborate treatise in favor of Eternal Torment, published by the Am. Tract Society, from the pen of Prof. S. C. Bartlett, D. D., of Chicago, is an illustration in point. The author sadly needs the reminder that certainly it is more Christian, and probably quite as effective, to answer an opponent's arguments, without continually assailing his motives. In the outset of that work we are told that, notwithstanding the objection of his opponents to the use of the word annihilation, he will thus designate their views. We read, page 5, "it is indeed an indispensable term." Why indispensable? Is it because he fears to enter upon the discussion, unless he can begin his appeal to popular prejudice, by assuming to array against his antagonist both Philosophy and the Bible? He must or should be aware, that though the term Annihilation is not found in the Bible, that, which from its derivation, (*ad* and *nihi*l, to reduce to nothing,) it expresses, is often found there, as in Jehovah's language, Isaiah **XLI: 12**; "they shall

be as nothing, as a thing of naught." So in this Biblical way we understand the declaration "the soul that sinneth, it shall die," to mean, not that the elements of which it is composed are annihilated, but that its organization is totally destroyed. The individual as such, no longer exists, he is "a thing of naught." In the Biblical sense, he is annihilated.

2. Another writer, Rev. N. L. Rice, D. D., perhaps less skillful, certainly less offensive in his style, in a recent publication of the Presbyterian Board, informs us that the doctrine "*logically* involves the denial of the possibility of sin and holiness in man." "For matter," he asserts, "is incapable of voluntary action, and of course of moral action." When he has succeeded in demonstrating the falsity of the position so many physiologists hold, that the brain generates thought, then his conclusion may be a "logical" one, not till then. If thought be not evolved by the brain, but out of some immaterial entity distinct from the body, then animals must also possess the same, for who can deny to the dog, the horse, the elephant, a certain degree of premeditation and reason? And if the argument that 'what is immaterial must be immortal' proves anything, it proves that animals, possessing this immaterial something, are likewise immortal. The developing faculties of the child, keeping pace with the development of its immature brain; its intellect developed and strengthened by exercise, as other bodily functions; the vigor of the man's intellect proportioned to the depths and extent of the cortical, or cell portion, of his brain; injury of the brain attended by limitation of mental faculties; all go to show the absolute dependence of the thoughts upon the function of

this material organ ; as they perish altogether when this organ ceases to act, (Ps. cXLVI: 4.) The same writer falls into the error of assuming, in opposition to observers generally, that the mind is never unconscious even in sleep ; citing as one proof, the abnormal condition of somnambulism, (as if one could demonstrate healthful life from its diseased condition !) : and as a second proof, that we dream in sleep. But it is well known that sleep is not accompanied by dreams except it be disturbed, when the brain is partially aroused to consciousness and activity, and even then but partially, as shown by the usual confusion of thought in dreams.

3. It is objected that this doctrine of future destruction takes from the sinner the fear of future punishment ; that it robs the law of its terrors. To awaken the sinner, is it indeed, necessary to threaten him with such horrors as the human mind cannot conceive nor endure the thought of ? It is a fearful thing to fall, as a sinner, into the hands of the living God, who is able and will destroy the whole being in the fires of hell. But on this view, is it nothing—the loss of existence for ever ? Is it nothing—the looking forward to that fearful day of God's wrath, that shall burn as an oven, and utterly consume the wicked ? And yet, this doom is not such as would make the redeemed question the justice and mercy of their Heavenly Father ; it is not that frightful, imaginary hell, which would send up its shrieks and groans forever, to mingle even with the harmonies of heaven ! In reality the penalty popularly attached to sin, overleaps its mark. It is so excessive that the sinner, feeling he does not deserve it, will not believe that it can ever be executed. Or if, as in the case of the more unthinking, he really believes

in eternal torment, he quiets himself with the thought that a God of mercy must be so reluctant to inflict such a penalty, that He will, at the last moment, gladly except of even the semblance of repentance.

4. Another objection is founded upon our natural repugnance to lying in the grave till the resurrection. To the *survivors*, it is indeed a sad thought; and in truth, death is still an enemy, though hymns may sing of the Angel Death, who brings us to our God, and Young, in his Night Thoughts, may even hail our dreaded foe as the "Prince of Peace." (!) But this sleep, what is it to the sleeper himself? Closing his eyes to earth, the next *conscious* moment, and the trump of God, on the Resurrection morning, peals through the chambers of the dead, and calls him from his silent dwelling place. Do we call it gloomy to lay ourselves down at ten at night, and soundly, unconsciously sleep till the morning bell rouses us from our slumbers to a new day? Jesus said to St. John, the Revelator, (Rev. xxii: 20,) "I come quickly!" How quickly? If John's life were five years longer, he were just five years and an instant away from the promised coming of the Lord in his Kingdom. Nay, rather on this view, how solemn, how imposing the thought that the day of judgment is just before any one of us; "the Judge standeth before the door," (Jas. v: 9.) By fire, by flood, by sudden violence, our life may at any moment be taken—the next conscious moment, and the Judge has come! With this thought in mind how appropriate our Lord's warning, "Watch therefore, for ye know not what hour your Lord doth come, (Matt xxiv: 42.)

5. Some one may object to this Biblical conception of

the soul, that to him it seems to make no sufficient distinction between soul and body.

But does the objector observe that in bringing forward this objection, he opens the way for a like objection to the popular theory, and one which, carefully considered, is fatal to it? Between soul and spirit the popular theory in reality makes no distinction. And so Webster presents one as the synonym of the other. He gives a definition of spirit, "the soul of man, the intelligent, immaterial, immortal part of human beings;" and illustrates this by Eccles. xii: 7; "then shall the spirit return to God who gave it." We have already shown from the Bible that the spirit, (of man, as of animals,) is the principle of life, called in Scripture "the breath of life;" that an "intelligent being" cannot be that which *returns* to God, unless he was before with God, which surely is more than popular theology is prepared to claim.

That this popular confounding of soul and spirit is a radical error, the Bible demonstrates in its plain teaching of a marked distinction between the two. For example, Heb. iv: 12; "piercing to the dividing assunder of soul and spirit:" an unmeaning expression on the popular theory, but perfectly intelligible on the Bible view. Again, 1 Thess. v: 23; "And I pray God, your whole spirit, and soul, and body be preserved blameless."

What are we to understand from this latter passage? Certainly the popular theology does teach that though the Apostle appears here, in this three-fold division, to recognize a distinction between the three, that difference as between spirit and soul is so slight that *we* cannot recognize it, while between soul and body it is the utmost possible.

But what does the inspired word teach? In this enumeration of the constituent parts of the living man, it presents us first, the spirit, or vital principle, God given and to God returning. It is that which vivifies, which makes alive what without it were dead, as James (Chap. II: 26) declares, "the body without the spirit is dead." The spirit, being that which quickeneth, which gives life, as such death could not be, and is not, predicated of it, the *absence* of it being death; but, as we have already seen, in the Holy word death is again and again predicated of the soul. Next, we have two more constituents, soul and body; what distinction does the Bible make between these two? None so marked but that the term 'soul' the Bible *applies to the material frame, even when this has been deprived of its spirit!* See Numbers VI: 6, and IX: 6, 7, 10, already quoted, where "dead body" of our translations, is in the original, "dead soul," and this the language of the Creator himself to Moses. So in Leviticus XXI: 11, the word of Jehovah forbids the High Priest to comenear "to a dead body:" Heb. 'nephesh,' soul—a dead soul. So also Haggai 11: 13, and other passages.

And yet, though the Bible regards the two as so nearly the same, that it thus appears to apply the special name of the one to the other, still it does recognize a difference, as this passage in Thessalonians shows. Critically speaking, the term 'body' denotes the structure as such, referring to the material elements; which, in our present life, form an "earthly" body, but which in the future are to be replaced by elements of a higher order, in some way more highly vitalized, that is, possessing more of the vital principle, and so denominated "a *spirit*-ual body," (1 Cor.

xv: 44;) like to Christ's body after his resurrection to whose progress barred doors were no obstacle, (John xx: 19,) which could come and go like the wind, John iii: 8. *

While the term 'soul' refers to the organization as such, the thought being directed rather to the orderly assemblage of the different organs with their varied functions; in the Age to come, though virtually the same soul, yet with its changed and exalted constituents, becoming capable of other functions and powers as yet to us unknown.

But it may still be urged that this distinction is rather a verbal than a tangible one, that it must ever be impossible to present this soul without a body. Perhaps it may be so, for Paul, 1 Cor. xv: 44, calls our present earthly body, (in the original,) "psuchikon," a *soul*-ical or *soul*-ish one.

Yet let us see if this distinction may not be evidenced to our outward senses, as well as to our thoughts. We will suppose a healthy man has fallen into the water, and is rescued just as life seems to be extinct. You immediately set yourself about his resuscitation; alternately expanding and compressing the chest, you supply fresh air to the lungs, you omit nothing, if so be that the vital principle, the spirit, has not departed. But at last you give over effort, all is in vain. God has taken away that which He alone can restore. What is this which lies before you? The dead body of a man, you say. Yes, and it is likewise, in Scripture language, as truly a dead soul. The organization is intact, every organ is in place, and in such condition,

* John iii: 8; "The wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth: so is every one that is born of the spirit." Not, so is the manner of the birth of every one born of the Spirit, but so is EVERY ONE BORN OF THE SPIRIT: such will be the Saints of the Resurrection.

that the vital spark alone is needed to set the human machinery in motion again. A dead soul, as was Adam, when our Maker had formed him of the dust of the ground, ere he breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, by which he became alive, a living soul.

But now suppose again, that a man has been caught and drawn through between the heavy rollers of some powerful machinery. Every organ is pressed into a shapeless mass, the very bones are comminuted. Hastily you stop the machinery; you gather up tenderly the undistinguishable fragments; you enclose them in a proper receptacle, that you may give them decent burial. What have you now? The dead body of a man—it is all there; but not now as before is it a dead soul. It was, but it is no longer organized matter; the organism, the soul has been destroyed. The former body needed but the word of the Almighty calling back to it the breath of life, and like the widow's son of Nain, the man would "sit up and begin to speak;" the latter body requires first the creating hand of the same Almighty power to form anew the destroyed organs.

But can man destroy the soul? Is it not God who only can do that, and whom therefore in Matt. x: 28, we are warned to fear? Yes, man can destroy the soul. Read from the Bible, Josh. xi: 11; of the captors of Hazor, "they smote all *the souls* with the edge of the sword, *utterly destroying them*;" and other like passages already quoted. But this destruction, this death of man's doing, is not beyond recovery, it is but temporary. God has promised to, and will restore that soul "in the hour that is coming;" but the destruction of soul and body, which He makes in

the fires of Gehenna, is a final one. That death is permanent, eternal. Well may we fear, Who thus destroys!

On this view how intelligible all those otherwise puzzling Scripture expressions, as "He holdeth our soul in life;" "He spared not their soul from death;" "Thou wilt redeem my soul from the power of the grave;" "Thou wilt not leave my soul in (Heb. sheol) the grave, neither will Thou suffer Thine Holy One to see corruption;" this last, a prophecy of Christ, whose human organization, his soul, was not left in the grave to see corruption, but was raised again the third day; but was not a prophecy of David, whose soul was left in the grave, so that "he saw corruption," (Acts XIII: 36) and so, as we are told "he has not ascended into the Heavens," (Acts II: 34.)

But one has inquired, does not your definition of spirit conflict with such expressions as, "Sanctify God in your spirit," (I Cor. VI: 20; *) can we sanctify God in this vital principle? Most certainly. We can sanctify God in our thoughts, our emotions. These are the manifestations of the vital principle, the spirit within us. So fully is this recognized, that when in vigorous action, they take the name of 'spirit' from that whence they derive their activity. They owe their very existence to this vivifying principle, this breath of life, as we read, Job XXXII: 8; "But there is a spirit in man; and the in-spiration (in-breathing of this spirit, Gen. II: 7) of the Almighty giveth them understanding." And they cease when that breath of life is taken from us, as saith the Psalmist, "His breath goeth forth, in that very day his thoughts perish."

And while we thus regard thought and emotion as mani-

* Not in all the Greek manuscripts.

festations of the presence of the spirit, or breath of life, it will not be forgotten that they are the product of the soul's action. They result from the exercise of the functions of the soul, or human organization, as that is put in motion by this indwelling principle of life; and so we properly speak of the various emotions as being feelings in, or of, the soul. And at times, in the Hebrew, the word 'soul' stands for these emotions which are the fruit of its operation, as Gen. xxiii : 8; "If it be your mind" Heb. your soul. So also I Sam. xviii : 1; "the soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David."

It is to be expected that this doctrine, being so directly in conflict with the previous education and the life long prejudices of the generality of Christians, will at first encounter great opposition. Some no doubt will regard it as uprooting all that they hold dear; for with very few exceptions, the instruction of the pulpit, the Sabbath school, and of the fireside, the writings in prose and poetry of religious authors, all unite in proclaiming the inherent or natural immortality of the soul. But while such unanimity of sentiment should receive all due consideration, of course it cannot of itself weigh an atom against the declarations of God's word. With the Apostle we say, "Yea, let God be true, but every *man* a liar."

In these matters Revelation must be our guide. No less an authority than Timothy Dwight, a former President of Yale, declares, (Sermons, Vol I, No. 162,) "*Without revelation, the immortality of the soul must be entirely uncertain.*" And, however plausible may seem the deductions of philosophy and the argument from reason, the inner consciousness of every man commends the sentiment. Any knowledge of a future life apart from revelation, is simply impossible.

This needed revelation God has given us, but the church for many centuries has refused to receive it, in the way that language is ordinarily understood. Instead of taking it literally, except where there can be no question but that it is figurative, she declares that its language is mainly figurative, even where it were impossible to recognize this figurative intent, except upon her declaration. So long has this been the rule of the church, Protestant as well as Romanist, that many good Christians deem it almost sacrilege now to question it.

But the time of this blind subserviency to human authority is passing by. We have the right, it is our duty, to inquire—Has the church indeed read aright the Holy word? In this sin-ruined, sin-blinded world, in the struggle ever going on of truth with error, we may not unthinkingly assume that the truth in this matter has been triumphant. Whatever may have been our early training, what the beliefs of our revered fathers and religious teachers, however hoary with age the traditions of the church, with the faithful Bible student, with the humblest Christian, one word from our Heavenly Father, a single ‘*THUS SAITH THE LORD,*’ far, far outweighs them all! It well becomes every man to take heed how, upon the only foundation that can be laid, he builds up Christian doctrine for himself and others, for the day is coming that shall try by fire all such work. “If any man’s work shall abide, he shall receive a reward: if any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss!”

6. But it is asked, ‘If this be really the doctrine of the Bible, why is it that so many good and worthy men, the great bulk of Christians, at the present and for centu-

ries past, have failed to recognize and accept it?" The objection has much apparent weight, and much is made of it. But we forget how corrupt has been the church, and how comparatively recent is it, that the reformed church has regained that portion of truth she now holds. We have already noted the partial character of the Reformation of the XVIth Century, and the obstacles with which it contended. Is Satan less busy with the truth now than then? Is he not still "the Prince of the power of the air?" And wonderfully in this thing does he take advantage of the prevalent subserviency to the opinions of other men, which, especially on religious subjects, has marked mankind in all ages. It is related of the great Rabbi Hillel, the authority of whose name in after years silenced all controversy, that when he first began to teach, once on a time he reasoned all day to prove a certain point. No one would hear to him. At last in despair he cried out, "It must be so, for so I *received* it of the Rabbi Shammai." "Ah, why did you not tell us that before," was the reply; "*now* we will hear you!" So, although we have the standard of truth in our hands, and boast the right of private judgment, yet few are ready to read and think for themselves, but must submissively look about for some Christian Rabbi to do their thinking for them.

But vain reliance! In other sciences the professors and teachers are ever on the alert for new discoveries in the region of the great Unknown that lies all around us; but the reverse is true of theology. A bold man is that professor of the science, who ventures to hold and teach other than that he has received from the traditions of his elders. The fearful cry, heresy! heresy! which has brought many an

earnest Christian to the stake in days past, will soon be ringing in his ears. If he has a questioning mind, he had better expend its strength upon any doctrine rather than that of the inherent immortality of the soul; which is so flattering to man's pride, and so inwrought with the traditions of the church, though these came through Rome. And the minister in his pulpit must preach as he has been taught. As an educated man we can hardly expect him to investigate, certainly not readily to accept so *unphilosophical* a belief. Besides, no doubt for many of the ministry at present, their usefulness would be greatly impaired were they to state their convictions on this question. But the writer will speak for them, and he begs the reader to mark his words. From personal inquiry in different parts of the country he has reason to believe, that a large portion of the ministry are in reality swerving away from the faith once delivered to the saints. They hold on to inherent immortality, but they cannot in their hearts accept eternal torment. Therefore they lean towards so-called Restorationism, or practical Universalism. This is safer for them, to say the least, for it does not involve opposition to Satan's pet doctrine of natural immortality, or as the arch deceiver first formulated it, "Ye shall not surely die."

Nor for the laity has it been permitted, till a recent period, to inquire deeply into these matters: Not many years since, and the writer with his present un-orthodox, but Biblical, belief, would not have been permitted to retain his position as a church official, nor even that of church member. Surely in view of all these peculiar obstacles to the spread of this truth, we can but "thank God and take courage" that so much has been accomplished. And there has been

awakened an interest in these questions, and in the study of God's word, that will yet bear fruit. May it all be "TO THE GREATER GLORY OF GOD!"

My Brother Layman in the church: this question now set before you, and these facts as given you, bring to you a duty. It is first, that you carefully study the word of God, like the Berean Christians, searching the Scriptures daily whether these things are so. Decide this for yourself. Take it on no man's authority, but according to the light which God's Spirit and word give you.

It may be that if you are in advanced age, your early training and the power of old habits of thinking and of unquestioning submission to human authority may be so strong that such investigation will only perplex and confuse you. If you are of that number, let the matter pass. If you trust in Christ as your Saviour, He will give you life in the future, and will then kindly show you how much better He has been, than you thought Him.

But if the chains of habit press less heavily upon you, if your mind is free to search into the deeper truths of God's Justice and Love, and if you are led conscientiously to adopt the literal reading of the Bible as true; it is then your duty for the Church of Christ, and for God's work in this sinful world, to spread this truth. Among your neighbors, church friends and associates, wherever God gives you influence, there is your sphere of labor for him.

Look not to some one else to bring about this great reform. You have seen that we cannot look to our theological professors, or to many of the ministry. Neither can we hope that the religious magazines and periodicals will help spread the truth. Here is the writer's experience: In Feb.

1871, he re-published an *Essay on Future Punishment*, by Rev. Henry Constable, Prebendary of Cork, Ireland. A lengthy review of this appeared in the *New Englander* of the following October, and as it contained some misconceptions, and some uncourteous reflections, a request was made for permission to insert a reply. The prospectus of that magazine declares of it, "It disclaims allegiance to any party in theology or politics, and signifies the independence with which it acts by adopting as its motto the Horatian line, '*Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri.*'" (lit. accustomed to swear in the words of no master.) The year previous, the writer of this had, on personal solicitation from the editors, subscribed fifty dollars to help keep so independent a magazine above water. But the loud professions of its prospectus and of its classical motto, when they came to the test, were strangely ignored, and the writer was in effect informed, that the magazine was no place for a reply to its own charges! The reader can make his own comments.

No! help if at all must come from the simple, earnest laymen of the churches, and it is you, my Christian brother, who must do your part. Jesus came to bring life and immortality to light. As the Father sent him into the world, even so has He sent you: (John xvii: 18.) To Him ere long must we answer the question: 'How have you tilled your part of the field?' You, and we all, must do what we can to promote the study of the Bible, and to enlighten the Christian community on these points, till at last a public Christian sentiment will uphold our pastors in breaking away from the theologic trammels of the past, and in thinking and speaking out for themselves. What will you do?

And to you my Impenitent Friend, without God and without hope in this world, this question presents itself with a fearfully practical interest to you. It directly concerns you : what shall your future be ? It may be you are flattering yourself with the thought that you are immortal. This the word of God denies. Immortality is not yours by right ; yet most freely is it offered to you, if by "patient continuance in well doing" you will "seek for it." In that dread day, when "all in their graves shall hear the voice of the Son of Man and shall come forth," which Resurrection shall be yours—of life, or of condemnation ? Now is the time to secure immortality. Now it is for you to choose ; then it will be too late. Oh ! cannot the love of our God, who is not a stern, revengeful Judge, but a kind, infinitely loving and forgiving Father to us all, cannot his love for *your* soul, not wishing you to perish, but to have everlasting life, even sparing not His own Son to save you ; cannot such love reach your heart ? Take Him as your Saviour, give your spirit, and soul, and body, to Him, and in this life you will find that His service is a rich reward, and you "shall receive, in the world to come, LIFE EVERLASTING," Luke XVIII : 30. You may make this promise yours : "When Christ, *who is our Life*, shall appear, then shall ye also appear with Him in glory." For then "raised INCORRUPTIBLE," the righteous shall be "ever with the Lord."

"FOREVER WITH THE LORD,

AMEN ! SO LET IT BE !

LIFE FROM THE DEAD IS IN THAT WORD,

"TIS IMMORTALITY !"

APPENDIX.

It was the writer's intention, at the outset, and is so stated in the preface, to give merely "a sufficient number" of proof-texts to sustain his position. But the statements he has made are so opposed to our general thought and speech, and to theological teachings, that it has seemed desirable to bring from the Bible, our only repository of truth, more full proofs on certain points.

The reader will, ere this, have understood that the writer claims, that the soul is not an immaterial, immortal part of human beings, but that it is the proper ORGANISM of all *anima*-ted [Latin, *anima*, soul] beings, whether human or animal. While spirit, likewise a common attribute of man and animals, is THE VITAL PRINCIPLE, denominated also in the Bible, the breath of *life*. And that while this spirit is infused into the organism, or soul, the man, or animal, is a living soul; when this spirit is taken away, the same becomes a dead soul.

This is claimed to be the Bible Doctrine of the Soul. We now go, not to theological essays, but to the Bible, for our proof.

A.

IN THE BIBLE THE TERM "SOUL" IS USED OF ANIMALS AS IT IS OF HUMAN BEINGS.

Gen. I: 20; "GOD SAID, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath a *living soul*."
(English Version, "life.")

21; "Every living *soul* (English Version, "creature") which the waters brought forth."

24; "GOD SAID, Let the earth bring forth the living *soul* (E. V. creature) after his kind, cattle and creeping thing, and beast."

30; GOD SAID, * * to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is a *living soul*," (E. V. life;) that is, as we have now learned from the Bible, a living organism.

Gen. II: 19; "And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field and every fowl of the air; and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them: and whatsoever Adam called every living *soul* (E. V. creature) that was the name thereof." Read in this connection verse 7 of same chapter, "And the Lord God formed Adam of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and Adam became a *living soul*."

Gen. ix: 10; "And with every living *soul* (E. V. creature) that is with you, of the fowls, of the cattle, and and of every beast of the earth."

Gen. ix: 12; "between me and you and every living *soul* (E. V. creature) that is with you."

15; "every living *soul* (E. V. creature) of all flesh."

16; "every living *soul* (E. V. creature) of all flesh."

Ten times is the Hebrew of 'living soul' found in the first nine chapters of Genesis. Once, where it refers to man it is literally thus translated. In nine other instances, it refers to the lower orders of creation, and the fact of such reference is carefully concealed from the English reader, unacquainted with Hebrew. Please notice also that in seven of these nine instances, it is Jehovah who uses this un-orthodox language!

Precisely the same Hebrew words are found in Levit. xi: 10, referring to fishes, "All that have not fins and scales, of all that move in the waters, and of any living *soul* (E. V. thing) which is in the waters."

Also in Levit. xi: 46, "This is the law of the beasts and of the fowl, and of every living *soul*, (E. V. creature) that moveth in the waters, and of every *soul* (E. V. creature) that creepeth upon the earth."—And Jehovah is the speaker in these two instances also.

Levit. xxiv: 18; Jehovah declares, "He that killeth the soul of a beast (E. V. simply, beast) shall make it good, (or recompense) *soul* for *soul*." English Version has "beast for beast."

Numb. xxxi: 25, 28; "And the Lord spake unto Moses: Levy a tribute unto the Lord, one soul of five hundred, both of the persons, and of the beeves, and of the asses, and of the sheep."

Our English Version here classes together souls of men and of oxen, of asses and of sheep. How came our translators thus for once to give the literal rendering of the Hebrew? Was it because they could not well avoid it? Was it because of the evident fact that all of the usual substitutes here failed them? They could not translate 'soul' by 'life,' for that would imply that the lives of these men and animals were to be taken; they could not say, one 'person' of five hundred, since animals are included in the enumeration; they could not well substitute 'creature' or 'thing,' since men are included. And so of all the instances where the original Hebrew of the Bible speaks of the souls of animals, in this case only the English reader has had given him the literal truth!

Prov. vii: 23; "as a bird hasteth to the snare and knoweth not that it is for his soul." (E. V. life.)

Prov. 12: 10; "A righteous man regardeth the soul (E. V. life) of his beast:"—regardeth, careth for, not its life only, but the comfort of its physical organism, its soul.

Ezek. xlvii: 9; "There shall be a great multitude of fish, because these waters shall come thither, and every living soul (E. V. thing) shall live whither the river cometh."

Rev. xvi: 3; "And every *living soul* died *in the sea*."—The Greek of the New Testament corresponding to the Hebrew of the old. Here again our translators could not escape a literal rendering. The Greek 'psuche,' which is the same as the Hebrew 'nephesh,' when not rendered soul, is generally translated *life*, twice *heart*, three times *mind*. 'Living life died' were too absurd, heart or mind were little better, while the general acquaintance of scholars

with the Greek would not permit the substitution of thing for 'psuche,' soul, as could be done with the less familiar Hebrew, 'nepesh.'

And yet with all this proof that animals have, or are, souls, theologians teach us *that the possession of a soul is what distinguishes man from animals!*

B.

IN THE BIBLE THE MATERIAL NATURE OF THE SOUL IS THUS REFERRED TO :

It may touch various Material Objects :

Lev. v : 2 ; " If a soul touch any unclean thing, whether it be a carcase of an unclean beast, or a carcase of unclean cattle, or the carcase of unclean creeping things." See also Lev. vii : 21 ; xxii : 6 ; Num. xix : 22.

It may itself be touched, even when dead :

Num. xix : 11 ; " He that toucheth the dead soul of any man shall be unclean. (English Version for 'soul' gives "body," but in the Margin "soul of man.")

It may be hungry :

Prov. xix : 15 ; " An idle soul shall suffer hunger."

Prov. xxvii : 7 ; " The full soul loatheth (Heb. treadeth under foot) an honey comb ; but to the hungry soul every bitter thing is sweet."

It eats :

Lev. vii : 20 ; " The soul that eateth the flesh of the sacrifice"—So also verses 25, 27 ; xvii : 12, 15.

It satisfies its hunger :

Prov. vi : 30 ; " Men do not despise a thief if he steal to satisfy his soul, when he is hungry."

Prov. XIII: 25; "The righteous eateth to the satisfying of his soul; but the belly of the wicked shall want." See Jer. I: 19.

It enjoys eating and drinking:

Eccles. II: 24; "Nothing better for a man than that he should eat and drink and should make his *soul enjoy good* in his labor." (Our translators in the margin explain "soul enjoy good" by "delight his senses.")

It is thirsty:

Prov. XXV: 25; "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country."

It breathes:

I Kings XX: 82; Heb. "Let now my soul breathe.

It may be bought and sold:

Lev. XXII: 11; "If the priest buy any soul with his money." Ezek. XXVII: 13; "They traded the souls (E. V. persons) of men." Rev. XVIII: 12, 18; "The merchandise of * * souls of men."

It may be stolen:

Deut. XXIV: 7; "If a man be found stealing a soul, (E. V. any of his brethren.)

It is hunted (as a flea:)

I Sam. XXIV: 11, 14; David says to Saul, "Thou huntest my soul to take it. After whom dost thou pursue? after a dead dog, after a flea."

Psaln VII: 5; "Let the enemy persecute (Heb. pursue) my soul and take it."

The pursuer overtaking it may tear it to pieces:

Psaln VII: 2; "Lest he like a lion tear my soul rending it in pieces."

It is delivered to the sword :

Psalm xxii: 20; "Deliver my soul from the sword."

It is destroyed by the sword :

Josh. xi: 11; "They smote all the souls that were therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them."

It may escape physical danger by flying :

Jer. li: 6; "Flee out of the midst of Babylon, and deliver every man his soul."

It may escape danger by aid of a horse :

Amos ii: 15; "Neither shall he that rideth the horse deliver himself." Heb. *his soul*.

And by escaping danger it lives on :

Gen. xix: 20; Lot said, "Oh let me escape thither, (to Zoar) and my soul shall live."

It may be laid in iron :

Psalm cv: 18; He (Heb. *his soul*) was laid in iron." So the Margin gives it.

It goes into the grave :

Job xxxiii: 18; "He keepeth back his soul from the pit."

22; "Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave."

28; "He will deliver his soul from going into the pit;" or grave, as the same Hebrew word in verse 22d is translated.

Psalm xxx: 3; "Thou hast brought up my soul from the grave."

Isaiah xxxviii: 17; "Thou hast, in love to my soul, delivered it from the pit of corruption."

It may be left there, and "see corruption."

Psalm xvi: 10; Acts ii: 27; "Thou wilt not leave my soul in (Heb. Sheol, Greek, Hades) the grave, neither wilt Thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." We are expressly

informed in Acts that this was *not* spoken of David, whose soul we may then understand was left in the grave, so that he saw corruption. In Acts XIII: 36, Paul declares, "For David, after *he* had *served* his generation by the will of God, *fell* on sleep, and *was laid* unto his fathers, and *saw* corruption." Observe the same nominative to these verbs. Now read the corroborative statement in Acts II: 34, "For David is not ascended into the heavens." If it be claimed, as is universally done, that 'David' in these passages means David's body; then we ask, *who* "served his generation?" But this attempted solution virtually concedes the whole question, in that popular theology confesses that the Bible calls the lifeless, material frame, David; for this is just what we contend for, that the organized body is the man, is David; with the spirit or principle of life, David alive; without it, David dead.

Though left in the grave, it is not forever:

Psalms XLIX: 15; "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

Notwithstanding all this, theologians teach us that the soul is immaterial!

C.

IN THE BIBLE THE MORTAL NATURE OF THE SOUL IS THUS
REFERRED TO :

It should be observed that in the account of man's creation in Gen. ii: 7; the very term qualifying soul, viz. *living* soul, in itself implies the possibility of what we find afterward spoken of, viz: *dead* soul.

Gen. xvii: 14; "That soul shall be cut off from his people."

xxxvii: 21; "Let us not kill *him*," (Heb. his soul.)

Exod. xxxi: 14; "That soul shall be cut off from among his people."

Lev. vii: 21; "The soul that shall touch any unclean thing, shall be cut off from his people."

25; "Even the soul that eateth shall be cut off," etc.

xix: 8; The same.

xx: 6; "I will set my face against that soul, and will cut him off," etc.

xxiii: 29, 30; "Soul shall be cut off," "will I destroy."

xxiv: 17; "He that killeth any *man*," (Heb. any soul of man.)

Numb. ix: 13; "Soul shall be cut off," etc.

xv: 30, 31; "That soul shall be cut off."

xix: 20; "That soul shall utterly be cut off."

xxiii: 10; "Let me (Heb. my soul) die the death of the righteous."

xxxi: 19; "Whosoever hath killed any person," (Heb. soul.)

xxxv: 11, 15; "Killeth any person (Heb. soul) at unawares."

30; "Whoso killeth any person (soul,) the murderer shall be put to death; but one witness shall not

testify against any person (soul) to cause him to die."

Deut. xix: 6, 11; "Slay him," (Heb. his soul.) "smite him," (Heb. his soul.)

xxvii: 25; "Taketh reward to slay an innocent *person*," (Heb. soul.)

Josh. ii: 13; "Deliver our lives (Heb. souls) from death."

x: 28; "He utterly destroyed all the souls." So verses 30, 32, 35, 37, 39.

Josh. xi: 11; "Smote all the souls with edge of sword."

xx: 3, 9; Whosoever "killeth any person (Heb. soul) unawares."

Judges v: 18; "Jeopardied their lives (Heb. souls) unto the death."

xvi: 30; Samson said, "Let me (Heb. my soul) die with the Philistines."

i Sam. xxii: 23; "I have occasioned death of all the persons (souls) of thy father's house."

xxviii: 9; "Layest thou a snare for my life (Heb. soul) to cause me to die."

ii Sam. xiv: 7; "For the life (Heb. soul) of his brother whom he slew."

Job xxxiii: 18; "He keepeth back his soul from the pit," (grave.)

22; "Yea, his soul draweth near unto the grave."

28; "He will deliver his soul from going into the pit."

xxxvi: 14; "They (Heb. their soul) die in youth."

Psalms xxii: 20; "Deliver my soul from the sword."

xxx: 3; "O Lord thou hast brought up my soul from the grave; thou hast kept me alive, that I should not go down to the pit."

xxxiii: 19; "To deliver their soul from death."

xxxv: 7; "A pit they have digged for my soul;" (pit translated grave, in Job xxx: 22.)

xlx: 15; "God will redeem my soul from the power of the grave."

lvi: 13; "Thou hast delivered my soul from death."

lix: 2, 3; "Save me from bloody men, for, lo, they lie in wait for my soul."

lxxviii: 50; "He spared not their soul from death."

Psalms lxxxix: 48; "What man is he that liveth and shall not see death? shall he deliver his soul from the hand (or power) of the grave?"

xciv: 17; "Unless the Lord had been my help, my soul had almost (Heb. is 'quickly') dwelt in silence." Read with this **i Sam. ii: 9,** "the wicked shall be silent in darkness."

Prov. xxiii: 14; "Thou shalt beat him with the rod, and shalt deliver his soul from hell," (Heb. sheol, the grave.)

Isaiah liii: 12; "He poured out his soul unto death."

Jer. ii: 34; "In thy skirts is found the blood of the souls of the poor innocents."

xxxviii: 16; "The King sware, As the Lord liveth that made us this soul, I will not put thee to death, neither will I give thee into the hands of these men that seek thy life," (Heb. soul.)

xl: 14, 15; "To slay thee," (Heb. thy soul.)

Ezek. xiii: 19; "To slay the souls that should not die, and to save the souls alive that should not live.

xviii: 20, 21; "The soul that sinneth it shall die; but if

the wicked turn, he shall surely live, he shall not die."

xxii: 25; "Like a roaring lion ravening the prey, they have devoured souls."

27; "Like wolves ravening the prey, to destroy souls."

Acts iii: 23; "Every soul, who will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."

James v: 20; "Shall save a soul from death."

Rev. xvi: 3; "Every living soul died in the sea."

Notwithstanding all this, theology teaches that the soul cannot die—except in some figurative way!

D.

IN THE BIBLE THE SOUL IS REPRESENTED AS BEING AN OBJECT VISIBLE AND TANGIBLE, EVEN AFTER LIFE HAS DEPARTED.

Lev. xix: 28; "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for the dead." The literal Hebrew is "for a soul," the word dead being understood from the fact that it was only for one dead, that this flesh-cutting would be practised.

xxi: 1; "Defiled for the dead." Heb. on account of a soul, dead understood.

11; "Dead body." Heb. dead soul.

xxii: 4; "Unclean by the dead." Heb. by a soul, dead understood.

Numb. v: 2; "Defiled by the dead." Heb. by a soul, dead understood.

vi: 6; "At no dead body." Heb. dead soul.

Numb. vi: 11; "Sinned by the dead." Heb. by a soul, dead understood.

ix: 6; "Defiled by the dead body." Heb. by a soul, dead understood.

7; The same. Heb. by a soul, dead understood.

10; "By reason of a dead body." Heb. of a soul, dead understood.

xxxi: 19; "Hath killed any person (Heb. soul) and hath touched any slain." Here the adjective slain agrees in the Heb. with 'soul' supplied from preceding clause.

Haggai ii: 18; "Unclean by a dead body." Heb. soul, dead understood.

The Hebrew for "the dead" or "dead body" in the passages above is 'nephesh,' soul; twice with the Hebrew adjective for dead expressed, in the remaining instances understood from the context. In seven of the twelve instances it is the language of Jehovah Himself. Surely the Creator of the soul here stands in direct opposition to modern theologians. He gives us to understand that the soul, of which He speaks so often in His Word, dies, and after its death, is still a tangible object, perceptible to our senses. *They* teach us that the soul is an immortal, immaterial entity, which cannot die, and cannot be perceived by our senses. There cannot be much question here as to which has the right of it!

In the common language of men the term 'soul' is often used as it is in the Bible. A prominent daily journal, recently stated of a disaster at sea, that "over forty *souls* perished." As far as the writer is aware, the only explanation offered by theologians for this popular and Biblical use

of the word is, that it is an example of the figure of speech termed synecdoche, by which a part is put for the whole. But let us see for ourselves if this figure of speech will indeed bear the strain thus put upon it. To take one of many instances: we read in Josh. xi: 11, of the captors of Hazor. "they smote all the souls therein with the edge of the sword, utterly destroying them; they left not any to breathe." The language of this, a simple historical narrative should surely be taken in its simple literal sense: we understand that every soul *was* destroyed in the capture of that city. From other Scriptures we learn that they shall so remain, until the hour when they shall be recalled to life by Him, whose voice all in the graves shall hear. "No, no," says the theologian, "the soul I claim to be immortal, and when the Bible thus speaks of the physical destruction of the soul by physical means, it is by way of synecdoche, it means every human being was destroyed. A queer instance indeed of synecdoche, if a part which, we are told, cannot die, is put for the rest, which, on the same authority, alone can die! But this pretense of an explanation is an utter failure; there is no synecdoche in the case at all. In synecdoche, a part is put for the whole, what is affirmed of that part must then apply to the whole: the part is here declared literally utterly to perish, then the whole must thus literally perish. But does the whole thus literally perish, does the whole man thus die? "Surely not," replies our perplexed opponent, "my theology teaches that the body alone can literally die;" and this confession virtually gives up the very condition *essential to the existence* of synecdoche in the case. And on further investigation we find the use of this figure of speech breaks down beyond

all hope of recovery, since the Bible applies this same term 'soul' to animals, which according to the common theological teaching have no part that can be called soul. And still further, when we learn that the Bible, in the most plain and straightforward manner, speaks of the soul of man as itself dead, and as such, being tangible and communicating physical uncleanness, we are convinced that not all the figures of speech of the rhetorician, will sustain the popular theology in the discrepancy between its teachings and God's word. One or the other must give way, and the thoughtful Christian will not long hesitate by which he will abide.

Christian Men of thought and culture—to whom the Church looks as its leaders in religious truth—is it not high time for you seriously to consider these things? The truth of the material nature of the soul, clearly revealed in the Holy word, yet rejected by the Church at large, is being rapidly demonstrated to the world by men of Science, who are studying the revelations of God's Book of Nature. That all mental operations, even consciousness itself, are dependent upon the blood supplied to the brain, is a proven fact. The investigations of such physiologists as Schroeder van der Kolk, and others whose authority in the medical world is unquestioned, are proving to us the exact alteration of physical structure upon which mental aberration depends: They have shown most clearly that "the brains of patients who die insane, idiotic or imbecile, give evidence, on microscopic examination, of diseased conditions, sufficient to account for all the symptoms they may have

exhibited." In a recent protracted investigation before a Committee of the British Parliament, the fact was recognized that Intemperance, immorally yielded to at first, at last produces a condition of the physical system in which the patient is practically, in that direction, no longer a moral agent. He is physically unable to resist, and must be removed from the temptation and cared for in Sanitaria or elsewhere, until his physical powers are sufficiently recovered that he may be able to do right. All these investigations of an earnestly enquiring age, in reality confirm the teachings of God's word, which in this is still, as it ever has been, in advance of scientific research; for the same Almighty One, who has given us the written word, sustains and upholds all nature by the word of His power.

Is it not then high time, no longer to declaim against materialism, but candidly to investigate the records of the Bible, and to place your interpretation of that Divine Book where advancing Science can no longer attack it. The threatened contest cannot be long delayed; its result cannot be doubtful. As the Church has been obliged to give up her position with regard to the revolution of the earth upon its axis, though for a time she might close the mouth of the astronomer who first proclaimed it; as she has been obliged to give up her interpretation of the six days of Creation, but to find that Geology and the Bible were in full accord: so in this question of the material nature of the soul, which the Bible with hundred tongues proclaims, the Church, if she does not previously recognize it, will be compelled to accept the truth from men of Science. She has now the opportunity to grasp and wield those weapons, which the advancing hosts of Infidelity will otherwise use

against her. It is sad, very sad, that the cause of Human Salvation must suffer from the mistakes of its professed supporters.

Upon the Committee, English and American, for the revision of the Scriptures, a great responsibility rests; let not Christians forget to pray for them! They have a rare opportunity offered them, to serve the cause of God and Humanity, by giving us a literal interpretation of the Divine records; so pruning from our English version the errors, which the ignorance and superstition of the dark ages have engrafted upon it. To this end they possess an exacter knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, a fuller number of trustworthy manuscripts, and more general knowledge. It is their bounden duty thoroughly to investigate these matters, and conscientiously, without fear or favor, to give us the exact truth as it is in the original. May the Spirit of all Truth help them to discharge the high trust committed to them; that not only Christ's people now, but "in that Day" the great Judge Himself may say to them, "WELL DONE."

E.

THE SOUL AND ITS PARTS.

If the soul of man be the human organism, as we claim, the Scriptures teach, then the various organs, which make up the organism, are parts of the soul. And, if so, then the Bible should thus speak of them. It should associate the whole and its parts, assigning like attributes to each; and sometimes, by a true synecdoche, it should put a part for the whole, declaring of that part what is true of the whole.

This is just what the Bible does ; though our translators, apparently puzzled with such language, have not always made evident that which the original expresses.

We select a few of many examples.

Gen. xlix:6; Jacob says, "O my *soul*, come not thou into their secret: unto their assembly, O my *liver* (E. V. mine honor!), be not thou united."

Psaln xvi:9; "my *heart* is glad, my *liver* (E. V. glory!) rejoiceth, my *flesh* also shall rest in hope."

Psaln lvii:7, 8; "my *heart* is fixed. Awake up, my *liver*." (E. V. glory!)

Psaln cviii:1; "O God, my heart is fixed; I will sing and (Heb.) my *liver* (E. V. glory) shall give praise."

Psaln vii:5; "Let him persecute (Heb. pursue) my *soul*, and take it, let him tread down my life, and lay my *liver* (E. V. honor!) in the dust."

Lam. ii:11; "Mine *eyes* fail, my *bowels* are troubled, my *liver* (so E. V.) is poured upon the earth."

Psaln xxxi:9: "Mine *eye* is consumed with grief, yea my *soul* and my *belly*"—(are consumed.)

Prov. xiii:25; "The just eateth to the satisfying of his *soul*; but the *belly* of the wicked shall want."

Ezekiel vii:19; "They shall not satisfy their *souls*, nor fill their *bowels*."

Psaln xl:8; "Thy law is (margin) in the midst of my *bowels*."

Jer. xxxi:33; "I will put my law in their (Heb.) *bowels*, (E. V. inward parts), and write it in their *hearts*."

Prov. xxii:18; "For it is a pleasant thing if thou keep them (words of wisdom, verse 17) in thy *belly*, (so the margin, E. V. text, within thee.)"

John vii: 38; "Jesus cried, saying, he that believeth on me, as the Scripture hath said, out of his *belly* shall flow rivers of living water."

Prov. xx: 30; "So stripes (cleanse away evil from) the inward parts of the *belly*."

Job xxxii: 18; "the spirit of my *belly* (marginal reading) constraineth me."

Philemon 7; Paul writes, "The *bowels* of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother."

Philemon 12; "Therefore receive *him*, that is my own *bowels*." Here Paul uses the expression "my own bowels" as standing for the whole organization, his soul, himself; he says in effect, "receive him as myself."

Psalms xvi: 7; "My kidneys (E. V. reins) instruct me in the night season."

Jer. xii: 2; "Thou art near in their mouth, and far from their kidneys." (E. V. reins.)

Jer. xvii: 10; "I, the Lord, search the heart, I try the kidneys." (E. V. reins.)

Rev. ii: 23; "I am he that searcheth the kidneys (E. V. reins) and hearts."

Mark xii: 29, 30; "Jesus answered, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy *heart*, and with all thy *soul*, and with all thy *mind*, and with all thy *strength*." What is this but a cumulative form of expression, where the whole and one or more of its parts are brought together, as in legal phrase, to cover the whole ground?

Plainly then throughout the Bible, the various bodily organs, the liver, the heart, the kidneys, the bowels or viscera, those organs controlled by a special nervous system, the Great Sympathetic, are put for the soul, or associated with

it, as being allied in their operation. This mode of speech has, at the present day, in great measure, passed away, and yet, notwithstanding the inroads of philosophical ideas during centuries past, we find that in respect of one of these organs, the heart, this usage, in popular speech still holds good; and traces of the same are still apparent in our not uncommon use of the words, spleen and bile.

It may be objected that this is the mode of speech of a ruder age, when the true (philosophical?) conception of man's spiritual composition was not universally accepted as now. On the other hand, is it not more just to say, that like the Assyrian and Egyptian traditions of the Cherubim and the Sacred Tree, it is the relic of a still earlier age, when God communed with man face to face? It is quite the fashion in our day to speak of the crude ideas concerning God, and man's destiny, which always prevailed even among God's people up to the Christian era. We flippantly say, the truth was never revealed to them. How do we know that? How do we know what communications of His will, God may have made in those earlier days of personal intercourse? Even the heathen once knew more than we are apt to imagine, for Paul says (Rom. i: 21, 28,) "when they knew God," "they did not like to *retain* God in their knowledge." This prevalent decrying of the early revelations of the Old Testament, because we cannot make them harmonize with our present theories, is a grievous sin. It dishonors not only God's word, but the Author of Revelation Himself. We cannot gainsay the fact that the use of the language we are discussing, is that of our only repository of *spiritual* truth. It is found in the New and Old Testaments alike; and is indeed the language of the

Creator Himself, as recorded in Jer. xxxii: 41; "I will plant them in this land assuredly, with my whole *heart*, and with my whole *soul*."

F.

HEBREW, SHEOL,—GREEK, HADES,—THE GRAVE.

Very few of our readers are aware of the extent to which they have been misled, by the liberty our English translators have taken with the Hebrew word, Sheol. In the majority of instances they correctly render it, the grave, but very often, apparently to favor the idea that the Scriptures teach the orthodox hell, they render it hell. Such however is NOT the meaning of the word.

There is but one rational way to decide this question. How does Bible usage define the word? Here are the facts; let each judge for himself.

Moses, the earliest of the Biblical writers, uses Sheol seven times only. The first six times he unquestionably means by it the grave; would he, or any other writer, the next time he uses the same word, give to it a totally different meaning? Yet the seventh time our translators assume to change the meaning of the word, by substituting 'hell' for 'the grave'! Here are the instances

Gen. xxxvii: 35; Jacob said, "I will go down into Sheol (E. V. the grave) unto my son, mourning."

Gen. xlii: 38; "Then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to Sheol." (E. V. the grave.)

xliv: 29; "My grey hairs with sorrow to Sheol." (E. V. the grave.)

Gen. XLIV: 31: "His grey hairs to Sheol." (E. V. the grave.)

Numb. XVI: 30; "If the earth open her mouth and swallow them up, and they go down quick (alive) unto Sheol." (E. V. the pit.)

Numb. XVI: 33; "They went down alive into Sheol." (E. V. the pit.)

Deut. XXXII: 22; "For a fire is kindled in my anger, and shall burn unto the lowest Sheol, (E. V. hell!) and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains."

In Genesis, it would hardly do to make Jacob say he would go down to hell, or for his sons to say it of him. In the passage from Numbers, if one were to translate Sheol, hell, he must accept the inference that these wicked men went into that hell bodily, they actually went down there "alive," we are told. So Deut. XXXII: 22, was the only chance, for the benefit of an English reader, to get the word hell into the books of the Law. And in this instance it is sadly out of place with the context, and sadly at variance with present orthodox ideas; for the Lord is speaking of physical fire, which shall consume the earth, and the foundations of the mountains, as is also foretold in II Peter III: 10.

Sheol next occurs I Sam. II: 6; "The Lord killeth and maketh alive; he bringeth down to Sheol, (E. V. the grave) and bringeth up." The two parts of the verse express in different language the same thought, as required by the parallelism of Hebrew poetry.

II Sam. XXII: 6; "The sorrows (Margin, Heb. cords) of Sheol (E. V. hell) compassed me about; the snares of death prevented me." Here the parallelism calls for "the cords of the grave" to correspond with "the snares of death."

1 Kings ii: 9; "His hoar head bring thou down to Sheol."
(E. V. the grave.)

Job vii: 9; "Goeth down to Sheol," E. V. the grave.

xiv: 18; "O that thou wouldst hide me in Sheol,"
(E. V. the grave.)

Job xvii: 18; "Sheol (E. V. the grave) is my house, I
have made my bed in darkness."

Job xxi: 18; Sheol, E. V. the grave. xxiv: 19; Sheol
(E. V. the grave.)

But it were impossible to give all the instances of the use of Sheol as thus far, consecutively. It will be observed in those above quoted, that evidently 'the grave' is the correct rendering. And we may believe our translators would have thus rendered it in every instance, but for their desire to find some apparent support for the orthodox theory of hell. We will give a few more examples.

Psalm cxxxix: 8, is a familiar passage: "If I make my bed in Sheol," E. V. hell; properly the grave, the bed in which we sleep till the Resurrection morn. Compare Job xvii: 18, above quoted; where the two parallel clauses express the same idea.

Prov. vii: 27; "Her house is the way to Sheol (the grave, E. V. hell,) going down to the chambers of death." A correct rendering preserves the exact parallelism, "the grave" answering to "chambers of death."

In Ezekiel, chap. xxxi, the text itself demonstrates the true meaning of Sheol, and the inconsistent rendering of our translators. Verses 8 to 12, the Lord compares the Assyrian monarch to a cedar tree in Lebanon, and his fall to the fall of this mighty tree. Verse 14, we read of other Kings—styled, "trees by the waters,"—"they are all deliv-

ered unto death, to the nether (lower) parts of the earth, in the midst of the children of men, with them that go down to the pit." Verse 15, of the Assyrian, "Thus saith the Lord God, In the day that he went down into Sheol (E. V. *the grave*), I caused a mourning. I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field (i. e. other mighty men) fainted for him. Verse 16; I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall when I cast him down to Sheol, (E. V. *hell*!) with them that descend into the pit, and all the trees of Eden shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth. They—(in the nether parts of the earth, mark you)—went down into Sheol (E. V. *hell*!) with him." Here our translation, in rendering Sheol, as it occurs in two consecutive verses and in reference to the same act, in one case by 'the grave,' in the next instance, 'hell,' have unmistakably used these two words as synonymous terms!

In this connection read Ezek. xxxii: 18 and 21; "Son of Man, wail for the multitude of Egypt and cast them down, unto the nether parts of the earth, unto them that go down to the pit. The strong among the mighty shall speak to him out of the midst of Sheol (the grave, E. V. *hell*); they are gone down, they *lie* uncircumcised, *slain* with the sword;" that is, they lie *dead* in the grave.

In these two extracts from Ezekiel, plainly Sheol is located in the nether (lower or under) parts of the earth: those "delivered unto death, are delivered to the lower parts of the earth;" those in Sheol, "gone down to the pit" are in the lower parts of the earth. How do we understand this? We perceive that Sheol means not the separate grave of each individual—(a different Hebrew word expresses that

thought)—but that it is a general term for the state of all the dead whether they lie in careful sepulchre, or, as Jacob imagined of Joseph, they are torn and devoured by beasts of the field. And this general state of the dead, in the Oriental imagination was conceived of as a vast pit in the darkness of the lower parts of the earth; a vast burying place, or more correctly *cemetery* (Gr. Koimeterion, *sleeping chamber*) beneath the homes of the living, where are gathered the dead of all times past, who, slain by the sword (Ezek. xxxii: 21), or dying in their beds (Is. lvii: 2), lie like mummied forms stored away “in the sides of the pit.” Is. xiv: 15.

With this conception agrees the language of Isaiah xiv; 9-11; “Sheol (the grave, E. V. hell!) from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the [sleeping] dead for thee. All they shall speak and say unto thee, art thou also become weak as we, art thou become like unto us? The worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee.” Surely these speaking are not living ones in an orthodox hell; we have here beyond question a figurative description of the grave, where in the bold imagery of Oriental poetry, “the dead” are presented speaking one to the other, covered with worms. Precisely the same imagery Christ makes use of in the parable of Dives and Lazarus, where he represents *the dead* as speaking to each other. And let the reader not forget that the Old Testament, comparatively contemned and certainly neglected nowadays, was the Bible Christ studied, and which he enjoined his hearers to search, whose language was to him as household words.

Not only the thought, but this language of the Old Testa-

ment we find in the New. Matt. xii: 40, Christ speaks of his future three days' rest in the grave, as being "in the heart of the earth." And Paul (Eph. iv: 9, 10) thus refers to this same rest of our Lord in the grave, "Now that he ascended, what is it but that he also descended first into *the lower parts of the earth?* He that descended is *the same* that ascended up far above all things."

We are now prepared to understand one more mis-translated, mis-understood passage. Psalm ix: 17; "The wicked shall be turned into hell, and all the nations that forget God." The word translated 'hell' is Sheol, which we have learned means the grave; 'turned' is in the Hebrew, *returned*; (see Lange on Psalms.) And so this passage, specially relied upon to teach Sabbath School children the doctrine of the orthodox hell, in reality sets forth the truth that, after their final Judgment, the second death shall return the wicked to that Sheol, or grave, whence there is never again 'a coming forth.'

HADES.

In the Septuagint, the Jewish translation into Greek of the Old Testament, the Hebrew Sheol is, with scarce an exception, rendered by the Greek, Hades. We have learned from the Old Testament that Sheol means the grave, and the Septuagint is authority; for us and for the English translators, that Hades is its equivalent. Now let us see how our English version of the New Testament translates Hades.

Here are all the instances of its use:

Matt. xi: 23; "Thou Capernaum, which art exalted to heaven shall be brought down to Hades," the grave,

E. V. hell. This prophecy has already been fulfilled in so bringing that city to destruction, to the grave, that the place of its sepulchre can scarce be determined.

Luke x: 15; Same as above.

Matt. xvi: 18; "On this rock I will build my church, and the gates of Hades (the grave, E. V. hell,) shall not prevail against it." How do we understand this? Let Scripture interpret itself. In Job xxxviii: 17, Psalms ix: 13, and cvii: 18, we find a similar expression, "the gates of death," which the Septuagint renders "gates of Hades." In Rev. i: 18, Jesus tells John that He was dead, but is now alive forever more, and so his people, dead or dying, shall likewise be made alive forever more, for He has the keys of death and of Hades."—This is the word of Christ, John xiv: 19; "Because I live ye shall live also." The grave shall not hold His people, shall not prevail against His Church, for at the "appointed time" (Job xiv: 13, 14), He will open the gates of Hades, and from their graves, bring forth His people to glory. As we read in Hosea xiii: 14; "I will ransom them from the power of the grave." And in Ezek. xxxvii: 12—14; "Thus saith the Lord God, Behold O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves. * * And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and put my spirit in you, and ye *shall live*."

Luke xvi: 27; "The rich man died, and in Hades (the *grave*, E. V. hell) he lifted up his eyes, being in torment." A poetic figure like that quoted above from Ezek., Chap xxxi, where the dead in Hades are represented as "comforted in the nether parts of the earth" over the fall of the mighty one who had brought them to ruin. (See page 96.)

No one questions but that those Old Testament passages are highly wrought, dramatic representations of how dead ones might be supposed to feel and to speak. Is this passage in Luke anything different? To interpret it in like manner, is certainly strictly following the rule by which all written language should be interpreted: that it is always to be taken literally, except as proved to be figurative by a statement to that effect, or by the obvious circumstances of the case. In Ezekiel and Isaiah, dead persons, those *lying slain*, move and speak; that then is figurative. Precisely so in Luke, it is dead persons in Hades, the grave, who speak; then that is likewise figurative. To say, as is universally done, that one part of the narrative "being in torment" is literal, while other parts, the preceding clause of the same sentence even, and other allusions to bodily members, must be figurative, because disembodied spirits cannot have bodily parts, is but begging the very question at issue; it is simply assuming the very point which this parable is especially relied upon to prove.

Besides, if that one part is to be taken as a literal statement, that Dives, before the Resurrection, suffers the penalty of his sins in an orthodox hell, then Christ utters a parable which is a direct contradiction of his own words, when he says, (Rev. xxii: 12) "I come quickly; and my reward is *with me* (i. e. in my keeping) to give to every man as his work shall be." And that time of recompense he elsewhere tells us, is at the Resurrection, (Luke xiv: 14) and so the apostolic writers ever refer to it. Paul tells us (II Cor. v: 10,) "We must all appear before the Judgment seat of Christ, THAT every one may receive the thing done in the body." Will orthodoxy locate a Judgment at the hour of

each one's death? Christ says, Matt. xxv, it is "when the Son of Man shall come in his glory; and the expressed surprise of righteous and wicked alike, at the words of the Judge at that time, evidently declare there has been no previous Judgment.

Certainly the unbiassed reader must confess that our rendering of the parable is alone consistent with the accepted method of interpreting language, and with the rest of Scripture; while the popular interpretation of it, though so general, is in reality a piece of special pleading, and contradicts the Scriptures.

Acts ii: 31; "Thou wilt not leave my soul in Hades (the grave, E. V. hell); neither wilt thou suffer thy Holy One to see corruption;—quoted direct from Psalm xvi: 10, in which Sheol is the Hebrew for Hades. Read with this, Acts xiii: 36, 37; "For David, after *he* had *served* his own generation by the will of God, *fell* on sleep and *was laid* unto his fathers and *saw* corruption, but he, whom God *raised again, saw no corruption.*"

Rev. i: 18; "I have the keys of Hades and of death," (E. V. hell)

Rev. vi: 8; "A pale horse, and his name that sat on him was Death, and Hades (personified, the grave, E. V. hell) followed after."

Rev. xx: 13; "Death and Hades delivered up the dead who were in them." Hades here is plainly the grave, for what Hades delivered up, was the same that in this verse the sea delivered up, 'tous nekrous,' the dead bodies, which were in them. Our translators give 'hell' in the text, 'the grave' in the Margin.

But in the next verse they omit this important marginal

correction: "Death and Hades (E. V. hell) were cast into the lake of fire." This verse is the fulfillment of the prophecy in Hosea XIII: 14, "O grave, I will be thy destruction;" where the Hebrew Sheol (the grave) is in the Septuagint Greek, Hades.

But one instance more of the use of the word Hades in the New Testament remains, 1 Cor. xv: 55. Here, as elsewhere in both Testaments, Death and Hades are associated and personified. But the whole line of argument in this chapter so turns upon a resurrection from *the grave*, that our translators could not venture here to render Hades, hell. So we have it correctly; "O death, where is thy sting? O grave (Hades), where is thy victory?" Yet, as if to relieve themselves a little under this pressure, in the margin, they insert 'hell.'

GEHENNA—HELL.

This Greek word is invariably and properly translated, hell. It is the same as Tophet of the Old Testament, both names of the Valley of Hinnom, near Jerusalem, whose fires were ever burning to destroy the refuse of that city; and hence it is used as an appropriate name for the final burning at the end of the world. Our Saviour speaks of it, in Matt. v: 22; XVIII: 9, as the "Gehenna tou puros," the Gehenna of FIRE. And again he explains it in Mark ix: 43, as "hell (Gehenna), the unquenchable fire." We have the idea, though not the word, in Rev. xx: 14, "the lake of fire. Into this, we are there informed, is Hades cast, to be destroyed; into that fire, foretold in Deut. xxxii: 20, "which shall burn unto the lowest Sheol, (to the bottom of the grave), and shall consume the earth with her increase, and

set on fire the foundations of the mountains." It is also spoken of in Rev. xxi: 8, "as the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone."

Isaiah, chap. xxx: 33, thus speaks of this hell, this Gehenna of fire; "Tophet is ordained of old; for the King it is prepared: he hath made it deep and large; the pile thereof is fire and much wood: the breath of the Lord like a stream of brimstone doth kindle it." And its purpose is still further unfolded in Malachi iv: 1, "For behold, the day cometh that shall burn as an oven, and the proud, yea, and *all that do wickedly*, shall be *stubble*, and the day that cometh *shall burn them up*, saith the Lord of Hosts, that it leave them neither root nor branch."

As an illustration of this fiery doom, we have held out to us by Jude, the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah and the cities about them, which "are set forth for an example, suffering the vengeance of eternal fire." As our Lord tells us in Luke xvii: 29, 30; "the same day that Lot went out of Sodom, it rained fire and brimstone from heaven and DESTROYED them all. *Even thus shall it be* in the day when the Son of Man is revealed." And Peter explicitly declares (II Peter iii: 7), "the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the DAY OF JUDGMENT AND PERDITION* of ungodly men."

* Greek, *spoleia*, DESTRUCTION, the noun of the verb *apollumi*, properly translated 'destroyed' in the preceding passage from Luke, which foretells this event.

C.

THE NEW TESTAMENT IDEA OF THE INTERMEDIATE STATE.

It cannot be denied that the Old Testament represents the Intermediate State, or the interval between death and the Judgment, as an unconscious sleep, where "the wicked cease from troubling and the weary be at rest." But there are Christians, no doubt sincere, who believe that the Old Testament teachings are, on this point, unreliable. (1) They will accept only what the New Testament shall say on this question. Let us then examine the latter.

We shall find that both Christ and his Apostles make free use of the BIBLICAL *phraseology of their day*, when speaking of the death of believers. For example, John xi: 11; Jesus says, "Our friend Lazarus (literal Greek) *has fallen asleep*, but I go that I may *awake him out of sleep*." Certainly, He who spake as man never spake, was seeking not to perplex his disciples with a verbal ambiguity, but to enforce a truth. He was teaching them and us that death is a sleep, and we may trust Him in this matter, for His loving heart has assured us, "if it were not so, I would have told you." With this agrees his language, John ix: 4; "The night cometh, when no man can work." And so we understand why Lazarus, so long dead, had no revelations to make of a 'spirit world': he had nothing to tell; his sleep had been an undisturbed, a dreamless one, until Christ's voice aroused him, as in the Resurrection, it will arouse all the sleeping dead. (John v: 28.)

Matthew, Apostle and Evangelist, uses similar language (Matt. xxvii: 52) "Many bodies of the Saints, who *sleep*, arose."

Luke, as the writer of Acts, says (Acts 7: 60) of Stephen's death, "*he fell asleep*. And devout men carried *Stephen* to his burial." In recording Paul's speech at Antioch, in Pisidia, he uses the same language (Acts XIII: 36); "*David fell on sleep*."

Such seems a favorite mode of expression with Paul: for example:

I Cor. VII: 39; "If her husband be dead (Greek same as above, should *fall asleep*), she is at liberty to be married."

I Cor. XI: 30; "For this cause many are weak and sickly among you, and many *sleep*,"—that is, have died.

I Cor. XV: 6; "The greater part remain unto this present, but some are *fallen asleep*."

I Cor. XV: 18; "Then they also that are *fallen asleep* in Christ, are perished."

I Cor. XV: 20; "Christ is risen from the dead, a first fruits of them that *slept*."

I Cor. XV: 51; "Behold I shew you a mystery; we shall not all *sleep*."

I Thea. IV: 13; "But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them that are *asleep*." "Them that ARE asleep"—did not Paul mean what he wrote? You say, it is their bodies alone that sleep. Will you stand by that interpretation? Then you assert that the body is the personality, for it is that, then, which is referred to by the personal pronoun, "them"!

I Thea. IV: 14; "For, if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them that *sleep* in Jesus will God bring with him." That is, as Jesus was brought from death, so will God bring them.

I Thea. IV: 15; "For this we say unto you by the word

of the Lord, that we, who are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent (Greek, phthano, come before) them that are *asleep*,"—those still living shall not come before, in other words, shall not leave behind them that have died.

: 1 Thes. iv: 16; "For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the trump of God and the dead in Christ shall rise first, then, we who are alive and remain,"—*THEN*, and not till then does the promised change occur, and "this mortal put on immortality." These Thessalonian Christians, being in much tribulation, were eagerly "waiting for" (1 Thes. i: 10) their Lord from heaven. To quiet their anxiety for friends already dead, no longer waiting with them, Paul assures them from the Lord, that such, when the Lord does come, will not be left behind. "Wherefore, (he adds,) comfort one another with these words." How could they have had any such anxiety about these dear friends, if Paul had ever taught them that such were still alive and in God's presence? And how different this word of comfort, as also Christ's to Martha, "thy brother shall rise again"—shall live again, from what is usually administered to the bereaved in our day! Paul, who could refer to "visions and revelations of the Lord" (II Cor. xii: 1), has never one direct word of the present conscious felicity of sleeping Saints. In fact he explicitly contradicts this error. He declares that for himself (II Tim. iv: 8) and for others, the time of reward, the crown of blessedness and glory, is at the day of our Lord's appearing. He tells us it is "at the revelation of Jesus Christ," (II Thes. i: 7), "at His appearing and His Kingdom," II Tim. iv: 1. With his statements agree those of Peter (I Peter v: 4), and of John

(1 John III: 2.) They could fall asleep in peace, being "persuaded that He is able to keep that which they have committed to Him against that day." (II Tim. I: 12.)

Peter also, in his Epistles, speaks of the Intermediate State as a sleep: II Pet. III: 4; "For since the fathers *fell asleep*."

Surely these examples demonstrate the New Testament thought and usage, in reference to the state of the dead in Christ.

But we are farther assured that the writers of the New Testament viewed such death as a sleep, from noticing one of the verbs they used to denote the act of bringing dead ones back to life. For this, two verbs are used by them, 'egeiro' and 'anastemi,' inexactly rendered by the same word in our Version. The primary and usual meaning in the Greek classics of the former, egeiro, is to *awaken*, to arouse. It is thus used Matt. VIII: 25; "And his disciples came to him and *awoke* him, saying, Lord save us, we perish." In a secondary, evidently metaphorical sense, it less frequently denotes to lift up, to raise, as in John II: 19, 20; "Jesus said, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will awaken it."—(egeiro, in the future, evidently intended to be taken in its primary sense, though the English Version gives the secondary meaning, "will raise it up.") In their reply the Jews mistake the temple spoken of, and use egeiro figuratively. "Then said the Jews, Forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou *awaken* it (that is, raise it, Gr. egeiro, E. V. rear it up) in three days?" See by contrast the different verb in the report of the false witnesses (Matt. XXVI: 61); "This one said, I am able to destroy the temple [of God, and build it (*oikodomeo*, lit. to build a house) in three days."

The New Testament distinction between the two verbs, 'egeiro' to rouse, and 'anastemi,' to raise—one having reference to the first step of awaking, arousing, the second looking to the completed act of raising, or being raised up—is well shown in Mark XII: 25, 26; "When they shall *rise* (anastemi) from the dead (ek nekron), they neither 'marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels in heaven." In this verse, the reference is evidently to the life in a completed resurrection state. (Notice the force of 'ek nekron'; it is the resurrection *from out* the dead ones, the resurrection of the *just*, of which subsequent life is predicated.) In the next verse, the verb changes in the Greek, though unfortunately not in the English translation; "And as touching the dead that they *rise*,"—egeiro, lit. *are awakened*. No reference here to the activities of their future life; the question is simply whether they are to be awakened at all, and such future awakening Christ proves solely on this conception of death, as we have shown on page 22.

So, in the 15th chapter of I Corinthians, where the argument of the Apostle is not concerning a future resurrection life, but whether there be any resurrection at all, he invariably uses egeiro, not anastemi. For instance verse 35, the inquiry is, "How are the dead awakened, and with what body do they come?" Surely, had our translators rendered egeiro, when referring to the state of death, by this its New Testament sense of awaken, the common error on this question would have been much less prevalent.

Thus we see that not alone in the Old but in the New Testament, the Intermediate State is regarded as *a sleep*; and in pursuance of this idea, the first bringing back the sleeper to consciousness and life, is appropriately termed *awakening* him.

The New Testament explanation of the Old Testament types carries with it the same thought: Christ's sleeping saints cannot yet be with him. In the 11th chapter of Hebrews we read; "Into the Tabernacle called the Holiest of all, went the High Priest **ALONE** every year." Turning to Lev. xvi: 17, we find God had expressly commanded; "*there shall be no man in the tabernacle when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy place.*" Here is the type, now for its fulfillment. We learn from Heb. xi: 24, that thus was foreshadowed the Mediatorial work of Christ: "For Christ is not entered into the holy places made with hands, which are *the figures of the true*; but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God **FOR US.**" Christ is *now* our High Priest, now at the right hand of the Majesty in the heavens. (Heb. vii: 24 to viii: 2) He has gone there, as went the high priest into the earthly tabernacle, "not without blood," but it is "his own." And so the other conditions of the type must be fulfilled in him. He must go there **ALONE.** He declared to Nicodemus, "No man hath ascended up to heaven." Even to his disciples he said, as he had to the Jews, "Whither I go, ye cannot come." But soon after he adds, "Let not your heart be troubled. I will come again and receive you unto myself." From the tabernacle of old, his prescribed task completed, came forth the Jewish high priest to bless the people waiting outside. "And unto them that look for him, shall Christ appear the second time, without sin, (a sin offering) *unto salvation*" (Heb. xi: 28): that salvation (1 Peter i: 5), "ready to be revealed in the last time." As a High Priest, he is now gone from the sight of his people, he has entered within the veil. He will yet again come a King to reign, and whether,

In that day we have been "sleeping" in dust, or be "alive and remain unto his coming," our joyful hearts shall then exclaim, "Lo this is our God; we have waited for him: this is the LORD: we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation! (Isaiah xxix: 9.)

H.

THE RESURRECTION.

How the heart of the Christian, who believes the Bible doctrine of the soul, leaps up to meet that word, the Resurrection! It is the time of Reward! Then at last the absent Saviour makes good his word, and "comes again to receive us unto Himself," and then we see Him "whom not having seen we love." Then are re-united all who are Christ's at His coming; the Christian friends whom we have lost or must leave; the faithful workers for Christ in all the ages past are then awakened from their long sleep. Though dying centuries ago, it is to their consciousness as to ours, but the moment after death, and we all rise together in the morning!

Christ's resurrection is the pledge and type of our resurrection. Jesus says, "I was dead, and behold I am living forever more;" and, "Because I live, ye shall live also." Paul refers to it as the assurance of all our hopes for the future. 1 Cor. xv: 17, 18; "If Christ be not raised, (Greek *egegetai*, has not been *awakened*), then those having fallen *asleep* in Christ are perished:" that is, they will never be awakened. No awakening to life again, no future re-living without a resurrection! So Paul preached, and so we believe.

Unfortunately the translators of our English Version, very likely through ignorance, have concealed many Old Testament allusions to this great event. In "the Prayer of Moses the Man of God, Psalm xc," after dwelling upon the greatness of God's power, and the eternity of His years as contrasted with our feebleness and our frailty, how tame and flat our English rendering, "O satisfy us *early* with Thy mercy!" As if we would pitifully entreat the Almighty not to continue sending trouble upon us, but to give us soon some relief before we die! But the vision of the inspired poet reached far beyond. Away from this lifetime of sin and sorrow he turns to gaze upon the Christian's hope, that promised dawn of glory and immortality, whose radiance can gild even the dark clouds of trouble surrounding him. "O satisfy us, (he prays,) with thy mercy IN THE MORNING; that we may rejoice and be glad all our days." In the morning, when satisfied we "AWAKE in Thy likeness!"

That the Hebrew here 'in the morning' denotes the Resurrection morn, Lange demonstrates in his Introductory Notes to Genesis, (Am. Edition, page 142,) where he shows this expression to be found "in the earliest language and thinking of our race." He quotes from ancient Arabian writers, and from one who represents a beggar, beautifully saying of the donor who bestows a garment to cover his nakedness, "He shall be covered *to-day* with my praise, and *in the morning* shall be enrobed with the silk of Paradise."

So the Psalmist exultingly declares (Psalm xxx: 6); "Joy cometh *in the morning*." And again, (Psalm xlv: 5, margin); "God shall help her (his church), when *the morning* appeareth!" Paul, looking forward to that morning, says

of himself, (Phil. III: 11—14; "If by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained or were already perfect, but * * I press toward the mark for the prize." And One who himself was to die and re-vive, when standing beside the recent grave of him He loved, uttered that word of comfort which resounds through the Ages till He come again,—"**I am THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE.**" What He hath thus joined together, let not man presume to put asunder! It was by His Resurrection that Jesus actually brought to light Life and Immortality. Mortal before, He is now immortal; as He says, "I was dead, and behold, I am alive forever more." And so of the followers of Jesus—at their resurrection this mortal puts on immortality, and Eternal Life is ours. Thanks be unto God for His unspeakable gift!

But a question demands consideration :

Is there a Resurrection of the Wicked?

It would hardly seem that the literal Bible student could entertain a question of this. Yet there are some,* who, fully accepting the Scripture declaration of loss of life as the penalty for sin, seem to be so carried away by the strength of their reaction from orthodox errors, that they deny that the wicked will have even a temporary existence again. They believe that the first death is a final ending of all being to them, as to the beasts. But such, while they reject the orthodox method of figuratively explaining away the plain declarations of death for the wicked, inconsistently adopt the same figurative method of explaining away passages which teach a Resurrection for the wicked.

* Among them one of no less talent and attainment than Hon. O. S. Halsted, Ex-Chancellor of the State of New Jersey, to whose scholarly work on "The Theology of the Bible," the writer is greatly indebted for the Hebrew translation of many passages in this Appendix.

Let us look at the Scripture proofs on this question. We learn this truth:

1. *From repeated declarations in the Inspired Word.*

Acts xxiv: 15; Paul says of himself, (translated verbatim from the Greek,) "A hope having in God, which even they themselves (the Pharisees) expect, a resurrection about to be of dead ones, of just and also of unjust ones." The writer is utterly unable to construe this passage, so as to make the Apostle declare this resurrection of both classes to be merely the expectation of the Pharisees. The reference to them in the clause, "which they themselves expect" might be entirely stricken out, and still the construction of the sentence remain the same; 'anastasin' (resurrection) in apposition with and defining 'elpida,' hope.

John v: 28, 29: "The hour is coming in which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of condemnation." It cannot be that of the 'all,' *one part shall literally* 'hear and come forth' to the resurrection, and the *other part figuratively* 'hear and come forth,' by remaining in their graves!

Dan. xii: 2; "Many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, some to shame (to be felt by themselves) and everlasting contempt," (to be felt by those surviving them.)

We learn this truth:

2. *From the fact of a second resurrection.*

Rev. xx: 6: "Blessed and holy he that hath part in the first resurrection: on such the second death hath no power."

Rev. xxi: 8; "But the fearful, and unbelieving, and the abominable, * * and all liars, shall have their part in

the lake which burneth with fire and brimstone; which is the second death."

In the former verse the distinctive epithet, 'first,' unless utterly meaningless, evidently assures a second; while the explicitly stated peculiarity of that first resurrection, that the second death hath no power over those having part in it, convinces us that the second death cannot be a second installment of redeemed ones, for such in any case "shall not be hurt of the second death," (Rev. II: 11.)

The second verse teaches what is the second death, and that to it the wicked are obnoxious. How it could properly be called a second death, unless it be a repetition of the same loss of existence which was the first death, we cannot understand; nor again, how any one having once lost existence, could lose it a second time, unless it were temporarily restored to him by a resurrection.

This view of a *first* resurrection finds corroboration in Christ's language, Luke XIV: 14, specifying "the resurrection of the *just*."

And also in the distinction made (in the Greek) between the *anastasis nekron*, the resurrection of dead ones, of Acts XVII: 32, and the *anastasis ek nekron*, the resurrection *from out* dead ones, of Acts IV: 2. The former was addressed to Greeks not knowing any resurrection; the latter was addressed to Jews and is there specified as that "preached *through Jesus*;" that particular resurrection which He bestows upon his followers, the resurrection to life, of the just, the first resurrection. It was that to which Paul so eagerly aspired (Phil. III: 11); "If by any means I might attain unto the '*ex-anastasis*,' the resurrection *from out* the dead ones."

Again we recognize the resurrection of the wicked:

8. *In the description of the Final Judgment, and statement of who will be there.*

Matt. xxv: 31—46; "When the Son of Man shall come in his glory, before him *shall be gathered* all nations, and he shall separate them one from another as a shepherd divideth his sheep from his goats. He shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on his left. Then shall the King say unto them on his right hand. Then shall he also say to them on his left hand. Then shall they also answer him."

But it may be replied: these thus judged are only those living at that time, together with the raised righteous. Let us then search farther and learn who they are.

II Cor. v: 10; "For we must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad." That this applies to all men and not Christians only, the next verse shows: "Knowing therefore the terror of the Lord, we persuade men," (men then living): and it is belittling this "terror of the Lord" to suggest, that by suicide or by death a moment before the great scene, one might escape it and its consequences.

Rom. xiv: 10; "We shall all stand before the judgment seat of Christ." Not the Roman Christians only to whom he wrote, but the 'all' referred to in the next verse; "For as I live, saith the Lord, every knee shall bow to me, and every tongue shall confess to God."

Rev. xxii: 12; Jesus says he is coming, "to give to *every man* as his work shall be."

Rom. ii: 12, 16; "For *as many* as have sinned without law, shall also perish without law; and *as many* as have

sinned under law, shalt be judged by law. (When?) In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by Jesus Christ."

In Psalm xi: 6, taking the marginal rendering, we read: "Upon the wicked he shall rain quick, burning coals, fire and brimstone, and a burning tempest, this shall be the portion of their cup." This fiery death is plainly for the wicked of all time, who are spoken of without limitation in the Psalm. To meet this doom they must be raised to life again by him, "who quickeneth the dead." (Rom. iv: 17.)

But we have the explicit declaration that it is not alone the wicked then living who are judged. Rev. xx: 13, 15, tells us that the sea gave up its dead, and the grave its dead, and after judgment, "whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." This is the second death; having died once, they thus die again.

We are shut up to this truth:

4. *By certain passages of Scripture otherwise unintelligible.*

Matt. xxvi: 64; Jesus declares to the Sanhedrim, "I say unto you, Hereafter shall YE SEE the Son of Man coming in the clouds of heaven." He was unquestionably speaking to those there before him, he was directly addressing that wicked Council, not their descendants of some far distant age.

Rev. i: 7; "Every eye shall see Him, and they also who pierced Him." Like the preceeding passage, it were here doing inexcusable violence to the language, to pretend that it refers to the descendants of those who compassed the death of our Lord. Especially when we remember it was written by one who, as an eye witness of the scene, would

recall the personal actors therein. Surely this is proof on proof!


The Bible informs us that the penalty of sin is death. "The soul that sinneth, it shall die." The execution of that sentence is set forth in Rev. xxi: 8; those found guilty of sins there mentioned, having not their names in the book of life, "have their part in the lake that burneth with fire and brimstone, which is the *second* death." That they may be arraigned and tried before God's tribunal, there will be a resurrection of the wicked dead. Like him, whose children they are declared to be (John viii: 44), and with him we may believe, they are to be loosed for "a little season" (Rev. xx: 3) from the abyss,* from silence and darkness; to be returned to "the blackness of darkness forever" (Jude 13), when the justice of their second death shall have been made manifest to an assembled universe. They must stand before the Judge. "Every eye shall see Him, and they also who pierced Him" with their eyes must behold Him again. But this is not for them a resurrection unto life, but unto *condemnation*. "There shall be weeping and gnashing of teeth," said Jesus to the unbelieving Jews, "when YE SHALL SEE Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of God, and you yourselves thrust out." Lost to them forever now, is IMMORTALITY, that priceless *gift* of God's love! In Gehenna, the lake of fire, they meet a second death. And this punishment of their sin is everlasting, for—THAT DEATH IS ETERNAL!


* The meaning of the Greek, 'abyssos,' translated 'bottomless pit' in Rev. xx: 3, the Apostle explains for us, Rom. x: 7; "Say not, who shall descend into the 'abyssos,' that is, to bring back Christ *from the dead*,"—from the abyss, the state in which are the dead.


INDEX.

- Advantages** claimed for Bible doctrine of Soul—It honors God, 36; exalts the Bible, 37; insures preaching of future punishment, 44; subverts Universalism, 44; and Infidelity, 45; errors of Romanism, 45; of Spiritualism and Swedenborgianism, 46; helps in work of Missions, 46; rightly values the body, 47; brings Christian Unity, 53; promotes personal holiness, 54.
- Animals** have souls, 9, 38, 73; first nine chapters of Genesis on, 75; once literally expressed in English Version of O. T. and once in N. T., 76.
- Bible doctrine of soul** stated, 33, 73.
- Bible usage of word soul**, examples of, 12-16, 74-88.
- Body**, the spirit-ual, 62; the soul-ical (psychikon), 63.
- Bondage to tradition**, of religious thought and teachers, 68.
- Christ**, the antitypical high priest, goes *alone* into the holy of holies, 109.
- David** is not ascended into the heavens, 13, 80.
- Death**, a sleep to Lazarus (John xi: 11), 104; to Thessalonians, 105; the first and second, popular theory of, inconsistent, 40.
- Dead souls**, 14, 62; visible and tangible, 84.
- Eternal punishment** not eternally punishing, 30.
- Final destruction of wicked**, a Bible doctrine, 29; an early Egyptian belief, 27.
- Fire**, unquenchable, 30; of Gehenna, 102.
- Gain the world and lose the soul**, 14.
- Hades** properly translated, 98.
- Hell**, 102; gates of, 99.
- Immortality**, Bible statement of, 25; a gift of God, 34; begins at the Resurrection, 11, 26; revealed in O. T., 26; revelation of needful, 66; but misinterpreted by Church, 67; Satan's doctrine of, 69.
- Inferences** erroneous, explained—Thief on the Cross, 16; Dives and Lazarus, 17, 99; the Transfiguration, 18; "whole spirit, and soul, and body," 20, 61; our earthly house of this tabernacle, 21; desire to depart and be with Christ (Phil. i: 23), 21, 52; Christ's argument with Sadducees, 22; spirits in prison, 23.
- Intemperance**, at times a disease or physical defect, 88.
- Interpretation of written language**, literal or figurative, rule of, 32; ignored by the church, 37, 67.
- Laymen**, their duty, 70.

- Life on earth to be valued, 51; Hezekiah, David, Paul upon, 51.
- Luther, his views on interpretation of Scripture, 43; his Reformation incomplete, 35.
- Man, a mortal soul, 9, 81; wherein his existence differs from that of animals, 10.
- Materialism of the Bible, 33, 49, 77, 84.
- Ministry, the orthodox leaning towards Universalism, 68.
- Moses, desire to *see* the promised land, 52.
- New Testament agrees with the Old, 76; its doctrine of the Intermediate State.
- Objections answered—Bartlett's, this is Annihilation, 57; Rice's, makes sin and holiness logically impossible, 58; robs the law of its terrors, 59; natural repugnance to lying in the grave, 50; makes no sufficient distinction between soul and body, 63; is rejected by Christians generally, 67.
- Old Testament should not be despised, 92, 97.
- Organism human, how God has honored it, 48.
- Organs of body associated with the soul in mental acts, 92.
- Praying to dead Saints, 45.
- Religious periodicals fear free discussion of this Bible question, 70.
- Resurrection—of comparatively little importance on popular view, 87, 47; of Christ, the pledge of the Christian's, 11, 110; *out from* the dead, 55, 113; the next *conscious* moment after death, 56, 60, 110; the beginning of Eternal Life, 11, 26; "in the morning, 110; the wicked must rise, 112; to condemnation," 117.
- Sheol, how Moses uses the word, 93; the Bible demonstration of its meaning, 95.
- Smoke of torment, 31.
- Spirit, not a conscious entity returning to God, 11; not same as soul, 61; Bible definition of, 10, 73.
- Soul, Bible doctrine of stated, 33, 73; distinction between soul and body illustrated, 63.
- Synecdoche, nor any other figure of speech, can explain away the common Bible use of term soul, 87.
- Theology of Church in Dark Ages, 35.
- The Truth misunderstood or concealed by our English translators, 35, 35, 93, 109.
- To *infer* figurative use of a word because thus used elsewhere, no argument, 82.
- Tyndale, the Martyr, his belief, 28.
- Who saw corruption? (Acts XIII: 36) 80.
- World's early knowledge of religious truth, 92.









THE BORROWER WILL BE CHARGED
AN OVERDUE FEE IF THIS BOOK IS NOT
RETURNED TO THE LIBRARY ON OR
BEFORE THE LAST DATE STAMPED
BELOW. NON-RECEIPT OF OVERDUE
NOTICES DOES NOT EXEMPT THE
BORROWER FROM OVERDUE FEES.

CANCELLED
W I L L I A M S
BOOK DUE
MAR 1 1987
2219098

